Byzantine and Neohellenic Studies

Eugenia Russell

St Demetrius of Thessalonica

Cult and Devotion in the Middle Ages

6

Peter Lang

The cult of St Demetrius is of considerable age but it peaked with the emergence of his city, Thessalonica, as a prominent political and cultural centre in late Byzantium. This book examines the intensification of his popularity and veneration in the late Middle Ages and his impact on contemporary thought and ritual. The encomia written in the saint's honour are significant historical and literary monuments and in their suggestiveness and beauty they are on a level with many better-known works in medieval Greek. Indeed, the encomia have added historical interest because of the prominence of those who wrote them. The likes of Nicholas Kavasilas, Gregory Palamas, Constantine Harmenopoulos and Symeon of Thessalonica were the elite of late Byzantium in intellect and personal influence, while Nikephoros Gregoras was perhaps the finest of Byzantine minds. With their clear links to individual authors, the encomia on St Demetrius present opportunities to the historian and the literary critic, which are fully explored in this book, the first to give them sustained scholarly attention.

Eugenia Russell gained a PhD in History from Royal Holloway, University of London, with a thesis entitled 'Encomia to St Demetrius in Late Byzantine Thessalonica'. This book is a revised version of this doctoral thesis. She is the editor of *Spirituality in Late Byzantium* (2009).

www.peterlang.com

St Demetrius of Thessalonica

Byzantine and Neohellenic Studies

Vol. 6

Edited by
Andrew Louth and David Ricks

PETER LANG
Oxford • Bern • Berlin • Bruxelles • Frankfurt am Main • New York • Wien

Eugenia Russell

St Demetrius of Thessalonica

Cult and Devotion in the Middle Ages

PETER LANG
Oxford • Bern • Berlin • Bruxelles • Frankfurt am Main • New York • Wien

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:

Russell, Eugenia, 1976-
St. Demetrius of Thessalonica : cult and devotion in the Middle Ages / Eugenia Russell.
p. cm. -- (Byzantine and Neohellenic studies ; vol 6)
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN 978-3-0343-0181-7 (alk. paper)
1. Demetrius, Saint, 4th cent. 2. Thessalonike (Greece)--Church history. 3. Church history--Middle Ages, 600-1500. 4. Thessalonike (Greece)--History. I. Title. II. Title: Saint Demetrius of Thessalonica.
BR1720.D45R87 2010
272'.1092--dc22
2010006570

ISSN 1661-1187
ISBN 978-3-0343-0181-7

© Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers, Bern 2010
Hochfeldstrasse 32, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland
info@peterlang.com, www.peterlang.com, www.peterlang.net

All rights reserved.
All parts of this publication are protected by copyright.
Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution.
This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

Printed in Germany

Contents

Abbreviations		7
Introduction	Cult and Devotion in the City of Demetrius	9
Chapter One	Intertextuality in the Encomia	29
Chapter Two	Convention and Originality: The Athlete of Christ	65
Chapter Three	Internal Literary Evidence for the Festival of the Saint	83
Chapter Four	Signs of the Times: Responses to Contemporary Life	111
Aftermath		129
Appendix	Responses to the Fall of Thessalonica in 1430 by John Anagnostes in his Narration and Monody	133
Epilogue		147
Notes		149
Bibliography		181
Glossary		203
Index		207

Abbreviations

BZ = *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (Leipzig, 1892–)

CFHB = Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae

CSHB = Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae

CTPE = *Χριστιανική Θεσσαλονίκη Παλαιολόγειος Εποχή: Επιστημονικό Συμπόσιο*, Πατριαρχικόν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικών Μελετών, Ιερά Μονή Βλατάδων (Thessalonica, 1989)

DOP = *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (Washington DC, 1941–)

EEBS = *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* (Athens, 1924–)

EMS = *Ἑταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν*

M = *Μακεδονικά* (Thessalonica, 1940–)

NE = *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων* (Athens, 1904–27)

PG = J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeco-Latina* (Paris, 1857–66), 161 vols

PLP = *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, ed. Erich Trapp et al. 14 vols (Vienna, 1976–96)

PThS = *Πρακτικά Θεολογικού Συνεδρίου «Εἰς τιμὴν καὶ μνήμην τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου καὶ τοῖς ὅλοις ἁγιωτάτου ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Νικολάου Καβάσιλα τοῦ καὶ Χαμαετοῦ»* (Thessalonica, 1984)

Introduction
Cult and Devotion in the City of Demetrius*

> Even within the shrunken Byzantine empire, Constantinople ceased to hold a pre-eminent position. Other Byzantine cities, particularly Mistra and Thessalonica, had become rival centres of commerce and government.
>
> JONATHAN HARRIS, *Constantinople: Capital of Byzantium* (London and New York, 2007), p. 181.

The cult of St Demetrius is of considerable age but it peaked with the emergence of his city, Thessalonica, as a prominent political and cultural centre in late Byzantium. This book examines the intensification of his popularity and veneration in the late Middle Ages and his impact on contemporary thought and ritual. The encomia written in the saint's honour are significant historical and literary monuments and in their suggestiveness and beauty they are on a level with many better-known works in medieval Greek. Indeed, the encomia are of added historical interest because of the prominence of those who wrote them. The likes of Nicholas Kavasilas, Gregory Palamas, Constantine Harmenopoulos and Symeon of Thessalonica are the elite of late Byzantium in intellect and personal influence, while Nikephoros Gregoras is probably the finest Byzantine mind known to us to date. By contrast many of the finest other works of late medieval Greek literature are anonymous. This would include the

* AUTHOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: I hereby acknowledge my debt to my supervisor, Jonathan Harris. Any infelicities in this work, however, are my responsibility, not his.

Chronicle of Tocco, the *Chronicle of the Morea*, *Basil Digenes Akrites* and the lesser known but beautiful *Achilleid*. With their strong authorship, the encomia present additional opportunities to the historian and the literary critic. Yet the encomia to St Demetrius have not received focused scholarly attention until now: here they are examined in their entirety for the first time.

The adoration of St Demetrius in late Byzantine Thessalonica was, as I said, a reflection of the increased confidence and autonomy of the city. The prominence of the cult of the saint was a manifestation of a strong civic feeling, and its intensity increased as Thessalonica became more autonomous. This introducton puts the cult in its historical context. It flags up the importance of Thessalonica and the city's relationship with the imperial family of the Palaiologoi, the last dynasty of Byzantium, and introduces the reader to the legend of St Demetrius. Chapter One and Chapter Two are almost mirror images of one another. They analyse the multiple layers of the literary works of praise, otherwise called *laudes* or *encomia*, which the saint enjoyed in abundance in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Both chapters are concerned with subtexts, one of classical and the other of Biblical works. The third chapter looks at the details about the festival of St Demetrius found in the *corpus* of the encomia. The stunning descriptions of the rituals and the lively language will delight the reader. The last chapter views the encomia as mines of information for contemporary issues in civic life. There is great variation in how outspoken authors were prepared to be in their critique of contemporary life through the encomia; these degrees in circumspection will concern us mainly in the fourth chapter. A stylistic treatment of two works of lamentation for the fall of Thessalonica is appended. The different ways in which the author of the lamentations expresses himself in the contrasting genres are explored using the same methodological approaches that have been employed in the study of the encomia.

There are more Greek encomia to St Demetrius than to any other saint and most of them were written in the period we examine. There are some stunning descriptions of St Demetrius in the sources. St Demetrius is young, strong, brave; he is beautiful. He leads and

inspires. He saves with his purity. He redeems, he mediates. He is a true icon for his people. St Demetrius was an extremely popular military saint in the Byzantine period from the seventh century onwards, both within the Byzantine empire and amongst the Slavs.[1] His significance and popularity were such that throughout the Byzantine Empire there was no need to refer to him by name. In Byzantine writings, both religious and secular, he was often talked about as the *Myrovlytos* or *Myrovlytes*, which means the myrrh giver. This refers to the miraculous myrrh that was supposed to exude from his tomb. He was also called *athlophoros*, prize-bearer or *Megalomartys,* the Great Martyr. In the same way, Thessalonica was often simply referred to as the city of Demetrius, and, in some ways, it still is.

As regards the historical St Demetrius, almost nothing can be known for sure. He is said to have been martyred in Thessalonica under the Emperor Maximian, but even that simple fact is controversial: there were two emperors with that name in the late third and early fourth centuries. Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maximianus Herculius (c.250–310), usually known as Maximian, was co-emperor with the Roman Emperor Gaius Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus (284–305) known as Diocletian. Maximian was first made Caesar (285) and shortly after Augustus (286) of Diocletian. The other Maximian, Gaius Galerius Valerius Maximianus (c.250–311) was Caesar alongside Constantius Chlorus (c.250–306) under the two co-emperors just mentioned. Diocletian created those two Caesars in 293, further delegating his powers. Diocletian is therefore credited with the creation of the first Tetrarchy in the Roman Empire. To make the institution work, the two Augusti retired simultaneously in 305, allowing the two Caesars to take their place and appoint new Caesars.[2]

It is likely that it was the second Maximian, usually known as Galerius, who was the persecutor of St Demetrius. Both as Caesar and as Augustus, he spent much of his time in Thessalonica. His legacy to the city is two illustrious monuments, his Triumphal Arch, celebrating one of his victories, and the Rotunda, the latter being intended either as his tomb or as a temple to a god. In any case Galerius was never buried there. The Rotunda's origins are often forgotten because, in its capacity as a church dedicated to St George, it is one of the earliest

preserved Christian churches. Although it is often described as a basilica, it has a cylindrical architectural plan, akin to the Pantheon in Rome. A third monument, which was built on a grand scale, the palace of Galerius, does not survive but its remains have been revealed by archaeologists near the two other monuments. Galerius was known for his persecution of Christians, which he initiated while still a Caesar, and this, along with his presence in Thessalonica, makes him the most likely candidate.

In the encomia the two Maximians are often confused and merged. Certainly Maximian is the only name that appears for the emperor figure and not Galerius. Therefore in this study the name Maximian is preserved in keeping with the encomia. There are some instances where the confusion in the Byzantine authors becomes apparent when a variant of one of the names is used. Such an example can be found in Nicholas Kavasilas's third encomium where he calls the emperor 'Herculius', one of the names of the elder Maximian, who liked to call himself after Hercules.[3] Whether Kavasilas used this form of the name for metrical reasons or whether he simply liked to allude to the name of Hercules, he signifies the general confusion surrounding the two emperors. Gregory Palamas, as well, calls the emperor by the name of Hercules, 'Maximian Herculius' in his case.[4]

Whichever emperor was responsible, it seems clear that St Demetrius was martyred sometime in the late third century. His cult was based on legends that emerged later and can be detected in Thessalonica from at least the sixth century. In the centuries that followed, legends, passions (*passiones*), *vitae*, miracle stories and panegyric speeches were produced about him. Of these, the most influential text in formulating popular conceptions of Demetrius's life were the *Miracula*, produced during the seventh century.[5] There also survive three biographies, all dating from the ninth century onwards. These three works are by Photios, patriarch of Constantinople (858–867, 867–886), by the tenth-century scholar Symeon Metaphrastes and by an anonymous author. That by Metaphrastes is the longest and perhaps the most famous.[6]

It is from these works that the popular version of Demetrius's life was derived. According to this, Demetrius was a soldier in the Roman army who converted to Christianity and then started preaching

his new faith amongst the ranks. Maximian found out about this activity and summoned Demetrius into his presence. When Demetrius refused to recant, he was thrown into prison. Meanwhile, Nestor, a young soldier who had been converted by Demetrius, asked for his blessing in a forthcoming gladiatorial bout with Maximian's favourite, a man of exceptional strength called Lyaeus. Nestor is often called 'a second David' for taking on that unequal battle. Nestor won the ensuing fight and killed Lyaeus, in the name of Christ. In fury, Maximian ordered the execution of both Demetrius and Nestor. Some variants mention St Loupos, the servant of St Demetrius, who after his master's death performed healing miracles with Demetrius's ring and robe before being martyred himself. In iconography, sometimes Nestor and Loupos appear together[7], although that is not the case in the literary versions.

It was in his persona of a soldier that Demetrius had become so popular by the tenth century, along with other military saints such as St George, St Theodore Tyron and St Theodore Stratelates. The opening of the first ballad of *Digenes Akrites* refers to these military saints, singling Demetrius out for praise:

(…) ἔχων συνεργοῦσαν τε Θεοῦ τὴν χάριν,
καὶ Θεοτόκου τῆς ἀκαταμαχήτου,
καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἅμα καὶ ἀρχαγγέλων,
τῶν ἀθλοφόρων καὶ μεγάλων μαρτύρων,
Θεοδώρων τε τῶν πανενδοξοτάτων,
τοῦ στρατηλάτου καὶ τοῦ τίρωνος ἅμα,
τοῦ πολυάθλου γενναίου Γεωργίου,
καὶ θαυματουργοῦ καὶ μάρτυρος τῶν μαρτύρων
ἐνδοξοτάτου Δημητρίου, προστάτου
τοῦ Βασιλείου καὶ καύχημα καὶ κλέος
τοῦ νικοποιοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις[8]
[with aid of the grace of God
and of the unconquerable Mother of God,
together with the angels and archangels,
and the great victorious martyrs,
the all glorious Theodores
both the general and the recruit,
the noble George of many labours,
and the wonder-working martyr of martyrs,
the most glorious Dimitrios, protector

of Basil and boast and fame
of him who achieved victory over the opposing (…)].[9]

The reader will have noticed how St Demetrius is singled out in this passage as the protector of the legendary Basil Digenes Akrites, and he is more lavishly praised than the other saints.

As a soldier, Demetrius was the perfect patron saint for Thessalonica in the difficult times that the city faced from the late sixth century on.[10] He was credited with saving the city from the Avars and Slavs who overran the rest of the Balkans during the early seventh century, terrifying the attackers with his unexpected appearance.[11] When the Emperor Justinian II (685–695, 705–711) fought his way through to Thessalonica in 688 and made a triumphant entry to the city, one of his first actions was to grant the revenues of a salt lake to the church of St Demetrius in gratitude to the saint for his aid.[12] The saint was credited with the victory of Basil II over the rebel Bardas Phokas at Abydos in 989 and with raising the siege of Thessalonica during the revolt of Peter Deljan in around 1040.[13] Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118) allegedly dreamt that an icon of St Demetrius promised him victory over the Norman Bohemond at Larissa in 1083.[14] In the autumn of 1207 the Czar of the Bulgarians, Kalojan (1170–1207) was reputedly stopped from taking the city through being slain by St Demetrius, even though it may well have been the leader of the Cumans, Manastras, who assassinated him.[15] The saint also had the function of bringing cohesion. Jonathan Harris has suggested that a measure of the success of Michael VIII Palaiologos was that at his death in 1282 he was succeeded without bloodshed. His legacy of peace was further confirmed by the fact that his old rival to the throne, John Laskaris, was eventually buried at the monastery of St Demetrius in Constantinople. This was the favourite monastery of the Palaiologos family, who had adopted him as their patron saint.[16] Not that the saint was always successful. Thessalonica was captured and sacked by the Arabs in 904 and by the Sicilian Normans in 1185. In these cases, the withdrawal of his protection was attributed to the sins of the Thessalonians and was the subject of anguished laments.[17]

Given St Demetrius's role as protector, it is hardly surprising that his veneration was given primary importance in Thessalonica in Byzantine times. His cult was centred on the great fifth-century basilica that was dedicated to him, which a Byzantine writer claimed was 'built over the spot where he accomplished his heroic feats in the contest for Heaven and received the prize of victory'.[18] It housed his tomb, a separate silver-covered structure that stood in the centre of the transept, with lamps burning constantly.[19] A sweet-smelling myrrh somehow supposedly came out of the tomb and was credited with miraculous healings.[20] This continued without interruption until the Ottoman occupation, attracting a constant flow of pilgrims seeking to be healed. The myrrh was thought to have apotropaic as well as healing properties and its nature intrigued the faithful, becoming a theological question. Charalambos Bakirtzis has explained that, to the Byzantine mind, '*myron* was *myron*, just as water was water and oil was oil'. In other words, although *myron* can be understood as a substance similar to oil, it was perceived as a clearly distinct essence. 'The oil from the lamp of St Demetrius' seems to have 'had therapeutic properties before the *myron* appeared'.[21] The localisation of the saint has also been pointed out by Ruth Macrides and Paul Magdalino.[22] Macrides sees 'separatist tendencies' in the cult of St Demetrius. This she depicts boldly as 'the latent tug of war between Thessalonica and Constantinople'. She also calls Thessalonica 'the only other city in a position to compete with it'. In ecclesiastical terms, she points out how 'it can be seen that St Demetrios' ability to produce a substance by the same name as the sacramental oil of unction could be used as a challenge to patriarchal monopoly'.[23]

The veneration was at its most intense during Demetrius's feast period in October. Demetrius's feast day fell on 26 October and that of St Nestor the day after, but most of the month was given over to celebrations in Demetrius's honour.[24] New encomia were written every year to be used at the festival. The custom was that the first of two encomia would be delivered by a layman in the church of the Acheiropoietos, dedicated to the Virgin Mary and St Demetrius, on the eve of the saint's day. The name Panagia Acheiropoietos (i.e. Our Lady who is not made by hands) comes from a miraculous icon of the Virgin Mary. Another encomium was pronounced by the archbishop

in the church of St Demetrius on the feast day itself.[25] A litany and a re-enactment of the saint's martyrdom used to take place on the same day. This festival was combined with the commercial fair of *Demetria*, which may have been named after St Demetrius, although the name of the ancient goddess Demeter, an agricultural deity, is also very close to the root of the word, and a legitimate contender. This event attracted merchants from all over the empire and beyond and is described in the twelfth-century satirical work, *Timarion*.[26] The presence of merchants in *Timarion* has the ring of truth, as it has been established that Thessalonica was a centre for the production of silk and metalwork in Byzantium.[27]

The festival was such an integral part of city life that it kept going even under foreign rule. In 1425, during the period when the Venetians were holding Thessalonica, the citizens asked the Venetian officials to give two hundred hyperpyra in time of peace and one hundred in time of war towards the festival of St Demetrius in keeping with an old custom. This is in keeping with the Venetian practice of, at least in theory, respecting and promoting the continuation of local life and customs under their administration.[28]

Demetrius's cult suffered some setback when Thessalonica was sacked by the Sicilian Normans back in 1185. His tomb was looted and the silver ornamentation was stripped off. The miraculous myrrh was allegedly gathered in pots and used for cooking and one of the feet was removed from the saint's body, until order was restored and the Norman commander forbade further looting. It was even claimed by the Bulgars that St Demetrius had abandoned his home and moved north to Trnovo, the capital of the newly created second Bulgarian empire.[29] During the period of Latin rule in Thessalonica (1204–1224), some of the relics of St Demetrius were divided up and taken to the West.[30] Nevertheless, by the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, the period covered in this book, the cult of St Demetrius was as strong as ever in Thessalonica, if not stronger. So strong was it that John XIV Kalekas, patriarch of Constantinople (1334–1347), complained in 1337–8 that worshippers would run past the church of Christ to crowd into that dedicated to St Demetrius.[31]

There were a number of reasons for this. One of them was undoubtedly the fact that the city achieved a quasi-independence

during the fourteenth century. The trend in late Byzantium was for different parts of the shrinking empire to be ruled separately by a member of the imperial family as an appanage. In his *History*, Nikephoros Gregoras tells us how the founder of the Palaiologan dynasty, Michael VIII Palaiologos (1259–1282), had in mind the separation of Thessalonica and its hinterland from the rest of the empire, in favour of his son Constantine (1261–1306). What prevented the fruition of the plan was his death on a campaign in Thrace in 1282, as well as the bitter rivalry between Constantine and his brother, the new emperor Andronikos II (1282–1328). The intention for complete autonomy seems to be clear:

> ἐβούλετο γὰρ καὶ μελέτην εἶχε τοῖς σπλάγχνοις ἐμφωλεύουσαν ἐκ πολλοῦ τὸ περὶ Θεσσαλονίκην τε καὶ Μακεδονίαν μέρος τῆς ὅλης ἡγεμονίας Ῥωμαίων ἀποτεμὼν ἰδίαν ἀρχήν, τινα περιποιήσασθαι τούτῳ καὶ βασίλειον αὐτοκρατορίαν. καὶ εἰ μὴ φθάσας ὁ θάνατος αὐτὸν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων πεποίηκε, τάχ᾽ ἂν καὶ ἥλιος εἰς ἔργον προβάντα τὰ τῆς μελέτης ἐγνώριζεν· ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ καὶ θεῷ πρὸς βουλήσεως, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐς πέρας ἐκεχωρήκει τὸ πράγμα δυστυχίας μεστόν.[32] [because he wanted and he had intent in his heart lurking there from a long time back, to cut from his own dominion and the sovereignty of the Romans the part around Thessalonica and the whole of Macedonia, in order to make that part a reigning kingdom. And were it not for death catching up with him, he would have made his plan happen, and it is as if the sun himself knew what was his intention; but it was not the will of God, as became apparent, for the matter to go ahead, and it was an affair brimming with sorrow].

In spite of this, for much of the fourteenth century, Thessalonica was ruled separately from Constantinople. In 1303 the empress Eirene (Yolanda of Montferrat), wife of Andronikos II, had taken up residence in Thessalonica and established her own court there.[33] In 1351, another empress, Anna (Johanna of Savoy), widow of Andronikos III Palaiologos (1328–1341) and mother of John V Palaiologos (1354–1391), took up residence in the city and stayed until her death in 1365.[34] She adopted the title *despoina* and her reign provided a much-needed period of stability to the troubled city and was well-remembered. She was praised by prominent figures of Thessalonica like Nicholas Kavasilas and Philotheos Kokkinos for her patronage, her good government and her steadfastness in her adopted

Orthodox faith. Kavasilas calls her μεγίστη βασιλίς, greatest queen, and greets her as 'the saviour of his native city' after the 'storm' of the Zealot regime. Kokkinos calls her θαυμαστὴ καὶ φιλόχριστος βασιλίς, wondrous and Christ-loving queen.[35] Anna is also mentioned in the Synodikon, alongside other Byzantine emperors.[36] An inscription with her name, as Anna Palaiologina, survives to this day in the old walls of the Byzantine part of the city. That was done to commemorate the construction of that part of the wall at her time.[37] The presence of a separate court at Thessalonica meant that there was a separate source of patronage; this helped bring about an intellectual flowering in the city, ensuring that it was no longer under Constantinople's shadow.[38]

The trend for Thessalonica's quasi independence was accelerated when, some time in the 1360s, Adrianople fell to the Turks.[39] Henceforth Thessalonica was cut off from Constantinople by land and the link between the two cities could only be maintained by sea. The members of the imperial family who ruled there with the title of *despotes* (a Greek word meaning master, but not with the associations of the English word despot) were therefore able to follow a very independent policy. The most striking example is that of Manuel, second son of John V Palaiologos and the future Manuel II (1391–1425). In the winter of 1371–2, John V issued a chrysobull in favour of Manuel, giving him Thessalonica, together with Macedonia and, as an incentive, whatever else Manuel could grab from the Serbs and the Turks, as his appanage. On 25 September 1373, John went further and the Despot Manuel became co-emperor, despite being a younger son, at the age of 23.[40] In 1381, however, things took a new turn when Andronikos, John V's elder son, was reinstated as an heir to the throne. We do not have precise information about Manuel's reaction to this news but it would seem that in 1382, he decided to act on his own incentive and to form in Thessalonica what became disparagingly known amongst John V's circle in Constantinople as 'the new empire'. [41]

During his five-year rule there, Manuel carried out a policy of firm resistance to the Turkish pressure that was in contrast to the lukewarm stance of his father in Constantinople, who had accepted vassal status to the Ottoman sultan, Murad II (1362–1389). In the

words of John Barker, 'a more robust separatism' meant also a separate policy. Manuel had some military success as soon as he established himself in Thessalonica. That perhaps gave his supporters inflated hopes. In 1382, the important Eastern Macedonian city of Serres was back in Byzantine hands. The news of his bold resistance brought a stream of volunteers to Thessalonica to fight by his side. There is at least one more naval and one combined land and sea victory over the Turks reported in the sources. After that there were a series of defeats. Public opinion was split, and Manuel's resistance policy did not seem so popular. Manuel felt unwanted and left Thessalonica. He subsequently sought refuge under the Gattilusi of Lesvos. This decision seemed sensible, as the two families had marriage ties, and Manuel II was a brother-in-law to Francesco II Gattilusio.[42]

In spite of this retreat, Manuel's rule had brought some advantages to Thessalonica. The city enjoyed some tax privileges and exemptions and some special commercial rights. This allowed and encouraged a certain amount of autonomy and self-government within the city, and strengthened the aristocracy.[43] In later years, other despots of Thessalonica enjoyed similar independence. His nephew, John VII, who ruled Thessalonica between 1403 and 1408, was not known as *despotes* but as 'Emperor of All Thessaly'.[44] Manuel's son Andronikos, who ruled between 1408 and 1423, issued his own decrees, ὁρισμούς, and ruled as an independent, western-style, medieval king.[45] Andronikos was very young when he was first nominated Despot of Thessalonica by his father in 1408, and until 1416 the ruler of Thessalonica was effectively Manuel's right hand man, Demetrius Laskaris Leontaris.[46] The scheme of regency, often used for the imperial throne, and often having caused much anguish to Byzantium, was now transferred to a periphery that was made conscious of its own independence, but still liked to continue styling itself after the prototype of its iconic capital. In this light, it was only to be expected that the prestige of St Demetrius was to be enhanced as the patron not just of a provincial city but of a centre of government in its own right.

A second factor that enhanced the standing of St Demetrius in the later Byzantine period was the fact that his cult was no longer

restricted to Thessalonica. Pilgrims could now, for example, venerate a phial of his myrrh in the monastery of St John Stoudios in Constantinople.[47] This extension of the cult was no doubt partly because it so happened that Demetrius was also the patron saint of the Palaiologos family, who ruled in Constantinople between 1261 and 1453. This point was made clear by the founder of the dynasty, Michael VIII, when he issued a typikon for the refounded monastery of St Demetrius in Constantinople in 1282 and described the *Myrovlytes* as the ancestral protector of his family.[48] Other members of the family have left evidence for their link with the saint. There survives an *enkolpion* or pendant belonging to Demetrius Palaiologos, Despot of Thessalonica (1322–c.1340) and son of Andronikos II and Eirene. It is inscribed with the words of the poet Manuel Philes (1294–1334) which read:

> Τῷ δεσπότῃ τὰ στέρνα, Θετταλῶν πόλις·
> Δημήτριον γὰρ εἰς χρυσοῦν φέρει τάφον
> Ζωηφόρον βλύζοντα μυρίπνουν χύσιν.
> Ὁμώνυμος δ᾽ οὗν ἐστι Παλαιολόγος.[49]
> [The Despot's bosom is the city of the Thessalians,
> because it bears Demetrius there in a golden tomb.
> The tomb exudes life-giving *myron*.
> And this Palaiologos is a name-sake (of the martyr)].

The Palaiologoi were not the only Constantinopolitan family to look to St Demetrius as their patron. Another was the Apokaukoi. Alexios Apokaukos held the office of Megas Dux in the mid-fourteenth century. He was a close friend of Anna of Savoy, and had been a powerful opponent of John Kantakouzenos during the civil war of 1341–7. He also played an important role in Thessalonica during the Zealot uprising and his son John was governor of the city. Both men were murdered in 1345 but their family appears to have commissioned an icon of St Demetrius, which is now in the church of St Athanasios in Kastoria. The inscription describes the saint as both Demetrius and Apokaukos suggesting a very close link between the clan and their protector.[50] Demetrius also began to have a much higher profile throughout the empire. When a new cathedral, the church of the Mitropolis, was constructed in Mistra in the Peloponnese in 1291/2 it

too was dedicated to St Demetrius.[51] His image started to appear on Byzantine coins from the early twelfth century and by the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries he often was depicted on horseback, particularly coins issued by Manuel II and John VII. [52]

Finally and perhaps most important of all, the cult of St Demetrius was enhanced by the turbulent and threatening events that unfolded between 1350 and 1430. Not that the city was new to trouble. It had been regularly besieged by Slavs and Bulgars before being captured and sacked by the Arabs in 904 and again by the Normans in 1185. In the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, however, Thessalonica faced not only an external threat in the shape of the Ottoman Turks, but internal disunity caused by class tensions, dynastic strife and the theological controversy over hesychasm. Each of these factors and its impact on the cult needs to be examined in turn.

The most significant danger facing late Byzantine Thessalonica was the advance of the Ottoman Turks. They had first gained a foothold in Europe when they took Gallipoli in 1354 and their capture of Adrianople, as seen above, cut Thessalonica off from Constantinople and provided them with their first capital in Europe. In the decades that followed, Thessalonica's hinterland came increasingly under Ottoman control and during Manuel Palaiologos's rule in the city in 1382–7, Thessalonica came under direct siege. After Manuel's departure, the citizens opened the city gates to Murad I on 9 April 1387.[53] After some fifteen years of Turkish occupation, following the Ottoman defeat at the battle of Ankara, Thessalonica was restored to Byzantine administration in 1403 and for some years enjoyed a peaceful existence. Before long, however, Ottoman pressure resumed and Thessalonica was once more besieged in 1416. A new blockade by sultan Murad II (1421–1451) in 1422 pushed the city into despair. We read in the diary of a clerk who worked in the Cathedral in Thessalonica, written between 1419–38, that in June 1422:

> 'ὁρισμῷ τοῦ δυσεβοῦς Ἀμουράτη τοῦ αὐθέντου τῶν Τούρκων ἀπεκλείσθη ἡ Θεσσαλονίκη διὰ τοῦ Μπαράκου τοῦ Βρανέως καὶ αἰχμαλωτίσθη καὶ ἅπασα ἡ Καλαμαριά'[54] [by order of the impious Murad

> the ruler of the Turks, Thessalonica was blockaded by Bürak, son of Evren, and the whole of Kalamaria was captured].

A short chronicle even implies that the death of Manuel II on 21 July 1425 was the result of the tribulations of his beloved city:

> τὸ δὲ τοῦτο μαθὼν κῦρ Μανουὴλ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰ τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης λειποθυμήσας ἀπέθανε.[55] [and so, Lord Manuel the Basileus, learning this (news) relevant to Thessalonica, having fainted he died].

Increasingly it was felt that the Byzantines could not hold the city, so after much deliberation, it was transferred to Venetian administration. On 14 September 1423, the Venetians received an exhausted and demoralised city.[56] They were unsuccessful in defending it. In the spring of 1430, the Ottoman Sultan, Murad II, laid siege to Thessalonica once more. Weakened and largely depopulated, Thessalonica was unable to resist the assault and it fell to the Turks on 29 March 1430.[57]

Turning now to the internal tensions, the period that saw Thessalonica's increasing independence also saw a sharp widening of class division. These were made plain in the Zealot uprising of 1342 when the people of the city had attacked the property of the wealthy and set up their own government.[58] With the end of the Zealot regime in 1350, it seemed in a superficial way that the first threat to the stability of Thessalonica was extinguished, but this was not necessarily the case. The causes of the disruption that had led to the Zealot regime, namely inequality in the distribution of wealth, poverty, human suffering, usury, lack of co-ordination and a breakdown of civic communication and of any feeling of belonging, combined with a hard-hearted and unbending aristocracy, were still present in the city. Good government since the days of Anna of Savoy and continuing commercial activity had managed to soften the blow, but the underlying tensions were apparent, when the other two threats, the external enemy and the religious debate, put unity to the test.[59]

The strong support the Zealot uprising found in the general public was an expression of the feeling amongst the citizens that there was a need for social justice and for transparency in public affairs.[60] Long after the revolution of the Zealots had failed, the opinion that

there was a need for social reform lingered within Thessalonica. Manuel Palaiologos himself had felt the need to take steps towards it, and there is evidence of such ideas in the writings of Kavasilas, Palamas, and the three last metropolitans. Kavasilas is especially strong in the language he uses, and very concerned to denounce the practice of usury, as he believed that money lending led to corruption, social imbalance and exploitation of the poor.[61] As part of his programme for change, Manuel appropriated church property for the defence of the city in 1369 and 1371 and then later in 1390. In 1371, for instance, he gave temporarily half the monastic property of Mount Athos and the monasteries around Thessalonica to soldiers.[62]

Thessalonica witnessed division among its citizens but also among its rulers. The disharmony is exemplified by the relationship between Manuel II and his nephew John VII, who ruled in Thessalonica between 1403 and 1408. In April 1390, when Manuel's father John V was still emperor, John had seized Constantinople and had held the capital until September when Manuel had arrived with a fleet to evict him.[63] John had then fled to the Ottoman sultan but had later been reconciled to Manuel to the extent that Manuel had left John in charge of Constantinople in 1399. That was the time when Manuel departed for Italy to seek help for the besieged capital.[64] The chronicler Doukas, admittedly a late and unreliable source, praises Manuel for his wisdom and conciliatory spirit in a time that the presence of Bayezid outside the gates of Constantinople posed a grave danger for the empire. By making peace with John VII he took away Bayezid's diplomatic weapon. Doukas calls him 'σύννους' and 'παιδείας μεστός' in admiration for his actions. He says that the emperor came to a very good decision: 'βουλὴν βουλεύεται σοφωτάτην καὶ μάλα συνετικήν'[65] [he comes to a wise decision, and most accommodating]. He describes Manuel as a man filled with pity at the poverty of his people and worried about the sustainability of the empire in a time of such extreme need:

> ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Χριστιανικώτατος ὢν καὶ μεμνημένος τὰ θεῖα καὶ ἐν φρονήσει μεστός, ὁρῶν τὸ ὑπήκοον ἅπαν ταλαιπωρούμενον ὑπὸ ἐνδείας· μόδιος γὰρ σίτου ὑπὲρ τὰ εἴκοσι νομίσματα· καὶ ποῦ νόμισμα; οἴνου τε ὁμοίως καὶ ἄλλων ἀναγκαίων τροφῶν λεῖψις. ἐξ

> ἀνάγκης ὁ κοινὸς λαὸς εἰς ἀπιστίαν καὶ προδοσίαν πατρίδος ἑώρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξομολογεῖτο καθ᾽ ἑκάστην ὥραν τε καὶ ἡμέραν τῷ θεῷ, λέγων «μή μοι γένοιτο Χριστὲ βασιλεῦ, μηδὲ ἀκουσθήτω ἐν τοῖς ἀπείροις ἔθνεσι τῶν Χριστιανῶν ὅτι ἐν ἡμέραις Μανουὴλ τοῦ βασιλέως παρεδόθη ἡ πόλις καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἅγια καὶ τίμια σκεύη τοῖς ἀσεβέσι καὶ χριστομάχοις»[66] [and the Basileus being most Christian and remembering divine things, and being filled with good sense, he saw his people all being tormented by poverty; one modius of wheat was about twenty coins; and where were there coins to be found? And there was a similar dearth of wine and other necessary foods. From dire need the common people were at the point of possible disloyalty and betrayal, and he (i.e. Manuel) confessed to God every hour and day, by saying: 'do not let it be done to me, Christ the King, nor to be heard amongst all the nations of the Christians that in the days of Manuel the basileus the City was surrendered and also the holy and solemn objects that are in it, to the unholy people and foes of Christ'].

This is how he made the decision to go to the West in search of funds. He first went to the Peloponnese where he left 'τὴν δέσποιναν σὺν τοῖς τέκνοις ἐκεῖ· εἶχε γὰρ τὸν Ἰωάννην βρέφος καὶ τὸν Θεόδωρον νήπιον'[67] [his lady with the children there; for he had John who was only a child and Theodore an infant]. His son John mentioned here is later to be the Emperor John VIII. Unfortunately, Manuel's trust in his nephew was betrayed. John VII took advantage of his absence abroad to enter into negotiations both with the king of France and the Ottoman sultan to hand over Constantinople.[68] In the event, the defeat of Bayezid at Ankara in July 1402 removed the threat to Constantinople and allowed Manuel to return in June 1403. One of his first actions, according to Doukas, was to exile John to the island of Lemnos. [69]

The exile proved to be a short one. After Bayezid's defeat, one of his sons, Suleyman, had made his way to Adrianople and taken control of the Ottoman territories in the Balkans. Eager to cement his precarious position, Suleyman made contact with John VII, who was at that time still ruling in Constantinople, and offered advantageous terms. In a treaty concluded in early 1403, Suleyman returned to the Byzantines the city of Thessalonica, which had been in Turkish hands since 1387. [70] Once he was back in Constantinople, Manuel II had to decide who was to govern Thessalonica, which was still isolated from the capital by territory under Ottoman control. None of his sons was old enough to take on the task and his brother Theodore was despot of the Morea. He

therefore, probably reluctantly, appointed John VII as ruler of Thessalonica.

Despite the tension between them, Manuel and John must have been bound by a written contract of peace. Symeon of Thessalonica mentions certain συνθῆκαι (agreements) that were drawn up between Manuel and John. Such formal articles of agreement binding the two men must have been recorded back in 1399, but do not survive. Still, a document of September 1405 issued by Manuel makes reference to some of the clauses of the original document.[71] There must have been some formal procedure by which Manuel adopted John as his son, that would have been reflected in that document. Symeon of Thessalonica refers to such a relationship between them in more general terms. As part of this he mentions Manuel's warning to John not to be cut off in Selymvria where he would be helpless in the hands of Bayezid: 'Τότε τοίνυν ὁ φιλευσεβὴς Μανουὴλ τὸν ἀδελφιδοῦν Ἰωάννην εὐσεβῆ βασιλέα (…) καὶ ἀπειλὰς δεχόμενον, ἐγνωκὼς ὡς τῇ Σηλυβρίᾳ καὶ αὐτὸν ἐναποκλεισθῆναι μέλλοντα ἢ δόλῳ διαφθαρῆναι, διαμηνύει ὡς πατὴρ οὗτος τῷ υἱῷ' [72] [And then moreover the pious Manuel (warned) his nephew John the pious Basileus (…) and as he (John) was receiving threats, and as Manuel knew that he might either be isolated in Selymvria or be destroyed by deception, he sent word to him as a father would to a son]. The understanding that they managed to come to, is portrayed by Symeon in Christian terms as the peace of the Lord. Nevertheless there is a clear reference to their old fierceness (μῆνιν) that they had in their hearts:

> '(...) Χριστοῦ συνεργοῦντος, τῆς ἀληθοῦς καὶ μόνης ὄντως εἰρήνης σπένδονται πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ὡς καλὸν ἦν, καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ χείρα πιστῶν φρονοῦσι· καὶ γινώσκουσιν οἱ τῆς εἰρήνης μαθηταὶ καὶ δοῦλοι τοῦ εἰρηνικοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ Λόγου Θεοῦ, οἷον τὸ τῆς εἰρήνης καλὸν, καὶ παλαιὰν μὲν πάσαν ἀποβάλλονται μῆνιν, ἓν δὲ γίνονται ἐν Χριστῷ, καὶ ὡς ἦσαν τῷ γένει τε καὶ τῇ πίστει, πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς ἀποδείκνυνται'[73] [(…) With the contribution of Christ, they stipulate the true and only peace towards one another, as is good, and they have in mind their own interests and these of those under them; and they gained knowledge these students of peace and attendants of the peaceful Jesus and Word of God as to which is the good of peace; and they rid themselves of any of their old fierceness towards each other, and so they become one in Christ, and as they were by blood, they prove now to be by faith: father and son].

The verb σπένδονται here may actually refer to a formal treaty as well as informal cordiality.

The next five years saw a distinct tension between public concord and private antagonism. In theory, John VII enjoyed Manuel's entire confidence. In a letter to his friend Constantine Ivankos, written during this time, Manuel described John as 'an excellent charioteer who knows how to drive a chariot and a pilot seated at the tiller whose nod all obey'. In private on the other hand, Manuel retained deep feelings of resentment against his nephew and what he regarded as his treachery in the past. In a passage from another work that he later deleted, Manuel launched into a bitter attack on his nephew accusing him of plotting to destroy the empire.[74] The tension was only relieved in September 1408 when John VII prematurely died.[75]

The final cause of internal disunity was the theological controversy over hesychasm. The nature of hesychasm is discussed and debated by scholars to our day, and is studied with interest for its spiritual merit and its far-reaching implications. Hesychasm or *hesychia* is a term that had been used before the time we are examining in order to denote a devotion to the eremitic life. John Klimakos (c. 579–c. 649) had illustrated in great detail the value of such a path and the fruits of the spiritual labour. But in the period we are studying the term became specifically related to a group of monks who professed to be able to experience the Uncreated Light of the Transfiguration of the Lord on Mount Tabor, through a combination of bodily techniques and a method of intense prayer. This raised the question of the orthodoxy of the said hesychasm amongst the wider ecclesiastical community. Although these practices were not new, they came under scrutiny during the 1330s when Barlaam of Calabria made an outspoken attack on them and Gregory Palamas wrote in their defence. This had to be resolved in a painful way through lengthy ecclesiastical councils, and the process tormented the empire for many years. [76]

One aspect of the controversy was the rift over attitudes towards classical education. Though many of the hesychast leaders were highly educated, there was suspicion surrounding classical knowledge as a valid discipline for a Christian mind. They drew a sharp distinction between the inner, spiritual (*ἔσωθεν*) and outer,

classical (*ἔξωθεν*) learning, with pronounced favour for the former. Even when the latter was tolerated, certainly the inferiority of classics to patristic works was asserted.[77] Palamas denounced Barlaam because: 'ἐπαινεῖς τοὺς Ἕλληνας καὶ θαυμασίους ἀποκαλεῖς'[78] [you praise the Hellenes (i.e. the ancient Greeks) and call them excellent]. By contrast, the anti-hesychast Nikephoros Gregoras was contemptuous of Palamas's rejection of classical learning.[79]

The nature of Byzantine society meant that a theological controversy of that scale could not leave the empire unaffected. Thessalonica was at the heart of the storm. As many of the hesychast leaders were based in Thessalonica, or had links there, the impact of this on the city was very much felt.[80] They had close links to the monasteries of Mount Athos, the centres from which hesychast ideas were disseminated. The links and the exchange of ideas between the monastic centres and Thessalonica are also reflected in the art and decoration of the churches.[81] Thessalonica's later metropolitans were heavily influenced by the Athonite tradition, and many had served in Mount Athos first. They were all hesychasts, and politically some of them, though in varying degrees, took a defeatist position. For those who did, their main concern was the maintenance of the rights of the clergy, the smooth operation of the Church, and the Orthodox celebration of the Christian rite. That made it easier for them to collude with the pro-Ottoman faction within the walls that lobbied for a dignified resignation to what they saw as an inevitable future. More so, some of them felt that the Ottomans would act as protectors of Orthodoxy against the Catholic Venetians. This was not the case with the fiery Metropolitan Symeon, who managed to be both pro-Venetian and anti-Catholic, but also anti-Ottoman.

How did these pressures effect the cult of St Demetrius? The citizens of Thessalonica had always put their hopes in him. But during the last years of the Byzantine Empire, when the faith of the people in the political and military might of Byzantium was fading, the hope that St Demetrius was going to somehow rescue his city from misfortune once again led to even more desperate and intensified praise. This was not just the desperate practice of humble peasants acting in isolation. During his stay in Thessalonica during the 1380s,

Manuel II Palaiologos joined his people in expressing their hope that the saint might intervene and save the day. Metropolitan Symeon was convinced that Demetrius had struck down Sultan Mehmed I in 1421 and that he had miraculously supplied the city with food.[82]

In that light it is not surprising that the image of St Demetrius was often used as that of the perfect leader, the need for one being accentuated by the political instability and uncertainty. The military saints Michael (the Archangel), George, Mercurius and Theodore enjoyed similar veneration for their comparable qualities. It is indicative that Gregoras wrote an encomium jointly dedicated to the praise of saints Theodore, George and Demetrius. The fame of these saints was by no means confined to Thessalonica or even to the Byzantine empire. They were also revered in the Catholic world and were credited with the stunning victory of the First Crusade at Antioch in June 1098 when they were allegedly seen taking part in the battle.[83]

The deliverance of the body (from one's enemies) and of the soul (from transgression) were perceived as one and the same thing.[84] Military virtue was therefore accentuated, as it resembled a virtuous soul. Some emperors themselves during the fourteenth century were using the allusion in their favour, as they were given the title of *Christomimetes*, *or Mimetes Christou*, i.e. Imitator of Christ.[85] They were portrayed as imitating Christ in delivering the soul from evil, while they were supposed to be demonstrating that by being victorious over their enemies. In the encomia, St Demetrius is often referred to as an imitator of Christ, his virtuous life likened to Christ's, and his martyrdom likened to the Passion. His imitation of Christ is in fact a major theme to be found again and again in the encomia and also in hymnography.

Chapter One
Intertextuality in the Encomia

> The Spartan, borne upon his shield,
> *Was* not more free. (BYRON)

This chapter falls into two parts. In the first, the twenty-six encomia under consideration and their authors will be examined briefly in turn. Their structure and authorship will be examined to determine their individual qualities. Then another issue will be addressed that affects all these works, that of genre and the influence of classical models.

Turning first to structure and authorship, it seems logical to examine the encomia in chronological order and to begin with that by Theodore Metochites (1270–1332). Metochites was an important figure who played a central role in both the political and cultural life of his time. He was a prominent statesman who became Μέγας Λογοθέτης or Grand Logothete to the emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos (1282–1328). He was also an art patron who sponsored the refurbishment and redecoration of the monastery of St Saviour in Chora in Constantinople, and one of the foremost intellectuals of the so-called Palaiologan Renaissance.[1] The encomium to St Demetrius, however, was written when Metochites was a young man long before he achieved his eminent position and when his Greek style had yet to achieve its later renowned polish. It was written in gratitude to the saint whom Metochites believed had cured him of an illness which he had contracted abroad, perhaps on a diplomatic trip, and is one of the longest of the late Byzantine encomia.[2] This is very much the production of a Constantinopolitan intellectual. Metochites gives his audience a retelling of the saint's life and death but does so in Attic Greek. His intellectual interests are reflected in the content, especially a dialogue that he includes between Demetrius and the Emperor Maximian on the nature of time.

Nikephoros Gregoras (c.1293–c.1361) was a pupil of Metochites and was also a major figure of the Palaiologan intellectual revival. His interests were extraordinarily wide-ranging and included astronomy, mathematics, philosophy, music and theology. He was also the author of a *History*, which covered the years 1204 to about 1360. He played an important role in the Hesychast controversy of the 1340s, becoming the foremost critic and opponent of Palamite theology.[3] His encomium is also a production of youth, probably dating from before 1330 and long before his attack on Hesychasm. It was written, he said, at the behest of the citizens of Thessalonica and he may have been invited to read it in public in Thessalonica, long after its composition.[4] Like that of Metochites, it reflects its author's intellectual interests, but in a different way. Gregoras brings numerous figures from the classical and Hellenistic past into his encomium, some more central to the work than others. The most prominent of them is Alexander the Great, who is employed in various ways, mainly to be compared unfavourably with St Demetrius.

Like Gregoras, Gregory Palamas (1296–1359) was also a pupil of Metochites. Unlike the laymen Metochites and Gregoras, however, Palamas became a monk of Mount Athos at the age of twenty and was on the opposing side in the theological controversies of the 1340s. His *Triads in Defence of the Holy Hesychasts* sought to champion hesychast practices against the criticisms of Gregoras and others.[5] His encomium to St Demetrius was written when he was Metropolitan of Thessalonica (1347–59) and was given as a sermon on 27 October, the feast of St Nestor.[6] Although Palamas had the same educational background as Gregoras, his encomium is very different. The main foil to St Demetrius is not Alexander the Great but King David, reflecting Palamas's rejection of worldly education. As a metropolitan of Thessalonica, rather than a Constantinopolitan intellectual, his encomium reflected the local topography as part of St Demetrius's cult.

Constantine Harmenopoulos (fl.1345–1359) is no lesser figure than Metochites, Gregoras or Palamas. It is sometimes forgotten that the law of the new Modern Greek State was based on his *Hexabiblos* (see below). A layman and a lawyer, he worked as a judge and *Nomophylax* in Thessalonica during the mid-fourteenth century. He

was an anti-hesychast alongside Gregoras and he is the author of a relatively unknown tome against Gregory Palamas, anonymously edited in the seventeenth century by Leon Allatius of Chios.[7] In his career he had to deal with some legal aspects of the hesychast controversy in which Nikos Veis praises him for his great sense of justice.[8] He is best known for having compiled a corpus of secular law in 1345, the *Hexabiblos* or *Procheiron Nomôn*, and a compilation of canon law, the *Epitome Kanonon* (1346).[9] He was, however, the author of a number of non-legal works such as two Lexicons on Syntax, treatises on heresy and fasting, and two respective catalogues on the offices held in the palace and in the church. His encomium to St Demetrius is amongst his most beautiful works. There is no clue as to when or why Harmenopoulos wrote it. This is a very localised encomium, for it focuses on one church in Thessalonica, the Acheiropoietos, and on the type of veneration that St Demetrius enjoyed there.

Philotheos Kokkinos (c.1300–c.1378) was a pupil and disciple of Gregory Palamas. As patriarch of Constantinople (1354–5, 1364–76) he was responsible for bringing about Palamas's canonisation in 1368 and for persecuting the remaining opponents of Palamite theology.[10] He was a prolific writer of homilies and hagiography as well as of hymns. His encomium was written between 1367 and 1372, that is to say during the very period when he was ensuring that Palamas's teaching became central to Orthodoxy.[11] The focal point for this very lengthy encomium is John 15.17: 'These things I command you, that ye love one another'; Kokkinos expounds on how Demetrius brought this commandment to life in his martyrdom.

Nicholas Kavasilas Chamaëtos (c.1322–c.1390) was a native of Thessalonica and a member of one of the most distinguished families of the city both on his father's and mother's sides. About Nicholas's father we know only from extant letters.[12] The main influence on his formative years was his maternal uncle Neilos, metropolitan of Thessalonica (1361–1363), patriarch of Constantinople (1380–1388), who paid for his education and from whom he took his surname of Kavasilas, in preference to Chamaëtos.[13] He was a layman and probably a lawyer,[14] and a prolific

author. His best known work is his *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* but he also wrote a devotional manual, *The Life in Christ*, as well as sermons, philosophical works and writings on social justice, including usury.[15]

Kavasilas wrote three encomia to St Demetrius. The first was a very precocious composition, written when he was a student in Constantinople in the early 1340s and the second soon after, the latter being a reworking of the former. These first two are enthusiastic works of praise, with emphasis on Demetrius's desire for martyrdom and love of Christ.[16] It is not known when the third was composed, but it probably appeared much later than the first two, to judge by the more mature style.[17] It is quite conventional in content but remarkable for its style. It is distinguished by being the only one of the encomia studied here that is in verse (dactylic hexameter) and is Homeric in idiom. Demetrius is praised as if he were a war hero. The third encomium is the most painstaking and technically demanding because of its structure but at the same time by its very nature perhaps the least spontaneous.

Isidore Glavas was Metropolitan of Thessalonica (1380–1384 and 1386–1396), his period of office coinciding with Manuel Palaiologos's defence of the city against the Turks in 1382–7. Although Isidore urged the citizens to support Manuel, he himself left the beleaguered city in 1384 and resided for a time in Constantinople. After the city's fall to the Turks in 1387, Isidore travelled to Asia Minor to negotiate with the sultan (on the behalf of the citizens) and by 1393 he had returned to Thessalonica.[18] He wrote no fewer than five encomia to St Demetrius, the last two of which can be dated by the indictions which Isidore gave in the title to 1393.[19] They all connect the saint with various pastoral themes, such as the monastic vocation, ingratitude to God and the duty of rulers. Demetrius is elevated as the perfect example to be followed in all these cases.

The monk Makarios Choumnos (fl. c.1360–1382) was the founder and first abbot of the monastery of Nea Moni in Thessalonica, which became an important spiritual centre in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.[20] He wrote only one encomium, the date of whose composition is not known, but which was clearly designed to be read out for the edification of the monks of Nea Moni on St

Demetrius's feast day. A very short work, it constitutes the last part of a larger oration on peace.[21] Its main theme is the poor conduct of the monks and Choumnos's appeal to the saint for help. Not many of Choumnos's writings survive but Vitalien Laurent has edited some more of his works, which puts his encomium in context. From them it is apparent that he addressed the brethren on a number of occasions and took his role of leadership seriously.[22]

Gabriel of Thessalonica was a monk of Nea Moni and a disciple of Makarios Choumnos. Moving to Constantinople, he became abbot of St Saviour in Chora, then Metropolitan of Chalcedon (1389–1397). He was then appointed Metropolitan of Thessalonica in succession to Isidore Glavas, a post which he held until either 1416 or 1419.[23] He wrote seven encomia which, like those of Isidore, link the saint to various moral themes. For example, in one of them, entitled 'Ὁμιλία περὶ ἀγάπης καὶ ἐν τῷ τέλει εἰς τὸν μεγαλομάρτυρα καὶ θαυματουργὸν Δημήτριον' [Homily on love and towards the end on the great martyr and miracle-worker Demetrius],[24] the theme of Christian love is prominent. Stylistically, however, Gabriel's encomia are far simpler and certainly much shorter. For example, themes include despair and overdue concern with everyday matters, neither of which, as one might expect, St Demetrius was ever guilty of.[25]

Demetrius Chrysoloras (c.1380–c.1420) was a member of a prominent Constantinopolitan literary family that also produced the scholar and diplomat Manuel Chrysoloras (d. 1415). He was a personal friend of Manuel II Palaiologos and a member of the emperor's literary circle. He was the recipient of several letters from the emperor and the author of a laudatory work of rhetoric comparing Manuel to former emperors. He seems also to have shared Manuel II's theological views and to have had little sympathy with those who advocated union with the western Church. As well as his encomium, he also wrote a thanksgiving speech in classical language in honour of the Virgin, protector of Constantinople, celebrating the defeat of Bayezid, at Ankara in 1402.[26] He was a literary figure of the time and a well-respected statesman. He must have been a charismatic speaker, and it is recorded that when in August 1409 he spoke on the subject of peace within the church, his words would have 'softened a stone'[27]. The respect that he enjoyed amongst his contemporaries is also evident in the two letters addressed

to him by John Chortasmenos, where also the classical knowledge and shared interest can be sensed. Mentions of Demosthenes, Euclid, Ptolemy, Homer, and Socrates give a flavour of the kind of conversations that would have taken place between them.[28]

The encomium by Demetrius Chrysoloras was probably written when he was living in Thessalonica between 1403 and 1408 as the *mesazon* or first minister of John VII Palaiologos. The work opens with conventional praises for the saint and concludes with equally conventional remarks on the myrrh that exuded from the tomb. The distinguishing feature of this encomium, however, is the long dialogue between Demetrius and the Emperor Maximian on the nature of the deity, which owes a great deal to Lucian.[29]

Symeon of Thessalonica was archbishop of the city from either 1416 or 1419, in succession to Gabriel, until 1429, the year of his death. He was not only an eyewitness to the last days before the Ottoman conquest of Thessalonica but also an influential leader who was able, to a degree, to sway opinion and policy. The chronicler John Anagnostes had great admiration for him and interpreted his death as a sign from God, who wished to spare the archbishop from the horrors that the rest of the population was shortly to experience.[30] Symeon wrote two encomia to St Demetrius. The first is quite short and conventional in content but highly laudatory and poetic in nature.[31] The second, which was written most likely between 1427 and 1428, is quite different.[32] Entitled Λόγος ῾Ιστορικός (Historical Speech), it recounts recent events in the history of Thessalonica from the first Turkish capture of the city in 1387 to the Venetian takeover and administration (1423–8). St Demetrius is credited with various miracles that took place during this time from supplying food in times of dearth to striking down a Turkish leader. Symeon, like Kokkinos, was also a prolific writer of hymns.[33]

The final author under consideration is George Kourtesis Scholarios (c.1400–c.1472). He was a prominent intellectual and judge in Constantinople during the 1430s and 1440s. A great admirer of Latin theology and especially the works of St Augustine, Scholarios attended the Council of Florence in 1438–9 where the Union of the Churches was agreed. Later, however, Scholarios became a passionate opponent of the Union of Florence and in about 1450 became a monk

with the name Gennadios. After the fall of Constantinople in 1453, Sultan Mehmed II appointed him Patriarch Gennadios II of Constantinople, an office that he held on three occasions (1454–9, 1463 and 1464–5) before spending his last years in the Monastery of Timios Prodromos at Serres.[34] His encomium to St Demetrius survives only in a fragment, albeit an autograph. Theodore Zeses suggests that it might have been written after 1453, perhaps in October 1456.[35] This dark encomium berates the sinfulness of Christians, their lack of piety, their drunkenness, their reluctance to go to church, and their worldliness. Demetrius is the antithesis of these vices, and the torments of Hell that await those who do not follow his example are described in graphic detail.

This summary of the authors and their work has shown how great a variety there is among the encomia. Perhaps the most obvious division among these authors is the extent to which they used classical Greek style and analogies in their work. Some did not do so at all. Symeon of Thessalonica, for instance, composed his encomia in engagingly transparent Greek, without classical allusions or rhetorical devices.[36] This absence may reflect either lack of classical education or deliberate choice. Philotheos Kokkinos, Isidore Glavas and George Scholarios were all educated men, but they appear to have chosen not to bring in many classical references. A few rare examples occur in Kokkinos's work. He cites a passage from Plutarch's *Life* of Alexander, where Alexander complains to his peers that his father is so successful in war that he will leave nothing for him to achieve when he gains power. Kokkinos uses the passage to compare the desire for glory that Alexander showed to the desire of supernatural glory that St Demetrius achieved. Curiously, the same passage is cited by Nikephoros Gregoras, though in a different context.[37] No such classical references appear in the encomia of Makarios Choumnos and Gabriel of Thessalonica, who may not have received any higher education at all.

It is, however, not with Choumnos and Gabriel that the rest of this chapter is concerned but with those that did allow ancient Greek language and models to influence their work, namely, Theodore Metochites, Nikephoros Gregoras, Gregory Palamas, Constantine

Harmenopoulos, Nicholas Kavasilas and Demetrius Chrysoloras. In order to appreciate their encomia as a literary form and the historical information they contain, one must first understand the genre in which they were written. These authors, like the authors of most Byzantine literature, were the product of an educational system based on the literature of ancient Greece and which instilled into students the need to write in the style of antiquity. What the Byzantines admired in the works of those authors the most, was the language. The many didactic, pedagogical works, often humorous, often in verse, that can be found within the large and varied body of Byzantine literature, and can be said to be minor in literary significance or impact, are due to this strong admiration for the polished and unblemished language of the classics. Byzantine authors had formed a canon of classical works that they studied with great persistence. When it came to their own writings they desired to follow classical prototypes to the letter. They imitated their vocabulary and syntax and even imported entire sentences into their own work with undiminished enthusiasm. It is amazing that with Byzantine values being so remote from those of the authors of classical and Hellenistic times, and indeed from the mythical material of Homer, Hesiod or Pindar, Byzantine intellectuals assimilated the entire body of classical literature with such great success and sought throughout the intellectual history of Byzantium to mould it into their own world view.[38]

Still, as a result of its classicizing language, Byzantine literature has more than occasionally been accused of artificiality and of being simply a slavish imitation of the writers of the past. The most celebrated exponent of this point of view is Cyril Mango. Mango sees in the engagement of the Byzantines with the past nothing but an 'antique mask'. He takes pleasure in quoting a statement of Romilly Jenkins (a statement that he does not dispute) that Byzantine literature '(…) produced hardly any educated writing which can be read with pleasure for its literary merit alone'. Mango not only views 'Byzantine literature as a distorting mirror' but also adds the word 'dim' to the distorting mirror of his title echoing St Paul.[39] His opinion of Byzantine literature is perhaps the most famous and far-reaching, and the views of non-specialists on the matter are certainly affected by it in a major way. It is

only very recently that there has been some evidence of a reversal of this belief, most notably in a recent volume edited by Elizabeth Jeffreys.[40]

The main charge levelled against Byzantine literature by its critics is that it slavishly imitates classical models, even occasionally lifting entire passages and repeating them word for word. An oft-cited example is the way that descriptions of outbreaks of plague in Byzantine writings are taken directly from Thucydides.[41] Here, it will be argued that classical language, ideas, themes and personalities are not simply mimicked in the encomia but are used creatively in a distinctive blend of classical and Christian themes. The longest and most complex amongst those examples will be examined last: this chapter ends with one of the most impressive passages in the entire collection, in which the statesman and philosopher Demetrius Chrysoloras recreates a work by Lucian. It will be used to show how Chrysoloras reworks the themes of the Lucianic dialogue to deal with contemporary Christian ideas of worship and sacrifice. Myth and classical allusion is used by him creatively, and the same high degree of inspiration and skill can be found in many of the authors under examination.

To start with, it is worth stating which classical authors were most influential on the authors of the encomia. One important model was the classical tradition of rhetorical speeches, particularly those by the celebrated Isocrates (436–338 BC), one of the ten Attic Orators, and the later Hermogenes of Tarsus (AD c.160–225), a contemporary of Marcus Aurelius. The link has been analysed by George Kustas, who outlines the Hermogenian principles, summarized in seven qualities of style. These are: a) σαφήνεια (clarity), b) ἀξίωμα λόγου (loftiness), c) κάλλος (beauty), d) γοργότης (conciseness), e) ἦθος (ethos), f) ἀλήθεια (truth), and g) δεινότης (force). He also draws attention to the devices of ἔκφρασις (description), διήγημα (narrative), and θέσις (statement of general interest in the form of a question).[42] Other genres and authors were influential, particularly the philosophers, notably Plato and Aristotle, the historians Herodotus and Thucydides and the playwrights, Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides.[43]

Perhaps the most important model of all was Homer, and especially the *Iliad*. Homer's works were intensely studied and read

throughout the Byzantine period. Robert Browning has given a survey of work done on the relationship between the Homeric epics and Byzantine literature.[44] Most studies that explore the influence of Homer are engaged with earlier Byzantine literature, as is that by Agne Vasilikopoulou-Ioannidou, on the twelfth century.[45] The many commentaries written on Homer by the Byzantines must not surprise us, as the Homeric epics served as manuals for the instruction of Byzantine schoolboys. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries notable figures such as John Pediasimos Pothos and Manuel Moschopoulos composed such commentaries.[46] Yet it is from a work of vernacular Greek that Browning selects his most moving example of Homeric allusion. In the late Byzantine poem *Achilleid*, the heroine Polyxena, whose eventual death is central to the plot, says to Achilles: 'Πατέρας καὶ μητέρα μου ἡ αὐθεντία σου εἶναι/ καὶ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἀδελφαὶ καὶ φῶς μου καὶ ζωή μου' [Your lordship is my father and my mother, and my brothers and my sisters, and my light and life]. This cannot but bring to mind Andromache's evocative appeal to Hector in Book Six of the *Iliad*, at their last meeting: '"Εκτορ, ἀτὰρ σύ μοί ἐσσι πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ/ ἠδὲ κασίγνητος, σὺ δέ μοι θαλερὸς παρακοίτης' [Hector, yet, you are my father and my revered mother and my sibling, and my youthful companion in bed].[47] In Andromache's case this statement a short while prior to Hector's death on the field of battle represents not only her emotional commitment but also the fact that her family were all killed in the wars with the Greeks. This is an instance in Homer that has been often highlighted in support of the view that there is an anti-war theme underlining the *Iliad*. So the author of the *Achilleid* makes reference to a very powerful passage, which discusses interdependence, duty, valour and sacrifice. This beautiful poem is not a retelling of the life of the Homeric Achilles but a Byzantine romance. Yet instances like this reflect its author's knowledge of the Homeric epics and his ability to adapt passages of dramatic intensity to suit his narrative. Passages with a similar strength of association will concern us later in the discussion of the encomia.

Having established the type of models that Byzantine authors used, we can now turn to examine how our classicising encomiasts employed

them. The first example will be of a minimalist classiciser, Gregory Palamas. Like Nikephoros Gregoras, Palamas had pursued his classical education to the highest level and was therefore as deeply imbued with ancient Greek literature as any of the others discussed here. Philotheos Kokkinos in the encomium he wrote for Palamas not only praises him for his high education in all subjects but also records the praise of Metochites for him in the presence of the Emperor Andronikos II. Metochites apparently said that Aristotle himself would have offered the young Palamas praise. The incident, which happened in 1313, was found by Kokkinos in Palamas's work *Against Gregoras* and repeated in his encomium.[48]

Although classical models are not as prominent a feature of Palamas's work as they are of those of Metochites or Chrysoloras, perhaps because Palamas wished to avoid the charge of pandering to worldly wisdom, nevertheless, they are still there. One example relates to the customary way to start an encomium. An ancient Greek *topos* when praising a personality was the expression of humility in view of the formidable task of praise. This is particularly clear in Xenophon's life of the Spartan King Agesilaus II, who reigned in the period of Spartan supremacy after the end of the Peloponnesian War. The virtue of Agesilaus is highlighted by Xenophon as something that makes it difficult to write fitting praise: 'Οἶδα μέν, ὅτι τῆς Ἀγησιλάου ἀρετῆς τε καὶ δόξης οὐ ῥᾴδιον ἄξιον ἔπαινον γράψαι, ὅμως δ᾽ ἐγχειρητέον· οὐ γὰρ ἄν καλῶς ἔχοι, εἰ ὅτι τελέως ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ἐγένετο, διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲ μειόνων τυγχάνοι ἐπαίνων.'[49] [I know that to write a eulogy of the virtue and glory of Agesilaus is not easy but it must be attempted; for it is not right that a perfect man who has become so good should receive less praise for that very reason]. This is a template that is followed in many of the encomia to St Demetrius, where the same apprehension before the daunting task ahead is indicated. Gregory Palamas is one of the authors who use this template. He says that despite his weakness in his ability to give adequate praise, he is moved by his love for the saint to speak up: ''Ο μέν τοι πόθος ἐπαίρει λέγειν πρὸς δύναμιν καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἐπιζητεῖ τὸν καίριον λόγον'[50] [Verily, my desire lifts me to speak to the best of my ability and the moment asks for the vital words].

Palamas's classical background blends into other parts of his speech too. Two of the most striking of those instances will be examined here. The Greek concept of *aristeia*, a word to describe the exploits of a hero, which is dominant in ancient literature, is employed by him to denote the excellence of St Demetrius by using it to refer to his accomplishments: 'τὰς ἀριστείας'.[51] To show the depth of the word *aristeia*, some examples of its use in ancient literature will follow. In Sophocles's play *Ajax*, the eponymous hero refers to the *κράτος ἀριστείας* [a supremacy of bravery] for which the weapons of Achilles should have been awarded to him: 'καίτοι τοσοῦτόν γ᾽ ἐξεπίστασθαι δοκῶ·/ εἰ ζῶν ᾽Αχιλλεὺς τῶν ὅπλων τῶν ὧν πέρι/ κρίνειν ἔμελλε κράτος ἀριστείας τινί, οὐκ ἄν τις αὖτ᾽ ἔμαρψεν ἄλλος ἀντ᾽ ἐμοῦ'[52] [and I know as much as this: if Achilles were alive and was to award these weapons for supremacy in bravery, no one would have seized them before me]. Instead, the weapons were given to Odysseus, an event that led to feelings of being devalued and eventually to the suicide of Ajax. The Alexandrian philologists who are thought to be responsible for the division of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in twenty-four books, marked by the twenty-four letters of the Ionic alphabet, have given the name of *ἀριστεία* to three of the books of the *Iliad*, those numbered five, sixteen and twenty-one. These refer to the *ἀριστεία* (the display of excellence in battle) of Diomedes, Patroclus and Achilles respectively. The bravery of Diomedes is already called *aristeia* by Herodotus in his discussion of the travels of the Trojan prince, Paris (called by him by his alternative name, Alexander): 'ἐπιμέμνηται δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐν Διομήδεος ἀριστείη· λέγει δὲ τὰ ἔπεα ὧδε.' [and this is mentioned in the *aristeia* of Diomedes; and the lines go as follows].[53] Much more dispassionately, in Plato's *Laws,* in the context of the discussion of military training there is reference to τὰς ἀριστείας τὰς κατὰ πόλεμον [excellence in the battlefield][54], in the pursuit of which instruction in dancing is recommended. In the historian Appian of Alexandria there is such mention in many instances from which I will highlight an example from his *Foreign Wars* where there is a description of a procession in which those honoured for bravery take part; this is in the context of Scipio's triumph against the

Carthaginians: 'οἱ δὲ ἀριστεῖς καὶ τὰ ἀριστεῖα ἐπίκεινται'[55] [and those who had excelled and their spoils had prime position].

The other example of classical knowledge to be detected in Palamas's encomium that we will look at is of a very different nature. It is also centred on a particular word, this time it is *ὀφιόδηκτος*. Palamas refers to a particular cure called *Θηριακή*, which was an antidote used for the treatment of those who had been bitten by snakes. This cure was first devised by the physician of the Emperor Nero, Andromachus of Crete, and is known to us through the prominent Greek physician Galen of Pergamon, who refers to it in his book *Περὶ Ἀντιδότων*.[56] Palamas refers to this cure to liken it to the cure made for souls that have fallen to sickness and need to be cured from their poisoned inner life.[57]

Unlike Palamas, who is sparing in his use of classical associations and does not flaunt his learning, Theodore Metochites actively draws attention to his classical references. He uses a phrase like ὃ φησὶν ἡ γραφή [as the scripture says] to make that clear.[58] For example he does so when he introduces a phrase from Plato's *Euthydemus*, λίνον λίνῳ συνάπτεις [you are attaching linen to thread].[59] In the Platonic dialogue, the eponymous character Euthydemus is arguing that if an entity has a certain characteristic at any given time, it does so always. Ctesippus responds to say that, in his argument Euthydemus mixes things that are dissimilar (λίνον λίνῳ συνάπτεις), a process which leads to peculiar conclusions. Metochites uses this phrase to allude to the fact that the matters of the material world are not to be confused with the Christian life.

To accentuate the fame that St Demetrius gained because of his virtue, Metochites chooses a phrase that points to the epic poet Hesiod. Hesiod in his poem *Works and Days*, a moral epic with a strong agricultural theme, advises against indulging in chatter, for 'δεινὴν δὲ βροτῶν ὑπαλεύεο φήμην. φήμη γάρ τε κακὴ πέλεται, κούφη μὲν ἀεῖραι ῥεῖα μάλ᾽, ἀργαλέη δὲ φέρειν, χαλεπὴ δ᾽ ἀποθέσθαι. φήμη δ΄ οὔτις πάμπαν ἀπόλλυται, ἥν τινα πολλοὶ λαοὶ φημίξωσι· θεὸς νύ τίς ἐστι καὶ αὐτή'[60] [it is hard for mortals to avoid talk. Talk behaves badly, is easily raised up in the air, is easy to bring about and grievous to get rid of. In fact, talk

cannot be erased altogether, as many people use her. In many ways, therefore, talk is a god]. In adapting this idea to the case of St Demetrius, Metochites remarks that *κούφοις ἡ φήμη πτεροῖς* [speech has nimble wings][61] commenting in this way on the widespread fame that the saint enjoyed. The negative connotation of rumour that we have seen in Hesiod becomes a positive one in Metochites. It is also noticeable that Metochites often does not leave a quotation from a classical text intact but he feels free to paraphrase.

In the dialogue between Maximian and St Demetrius about the true religion, Metochites has Maximian paraphrase something from Xenophon's *Cyropaideia* that shows the passing of time: χθὲς καὶ πρὸ τρίτης[62] [yesterday and before the day before]. In the case of Xenophon the discussion evolves around the preparation of an army for battle 'νῦν δ', ἔφη ὁ Κῦρος, τί ποιοῦσιν; ἐκτάττονται, ἔφασαν· καὶ ἐχθὲς δὲ καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἔπραττον'[63] [Now, said Cyrus, what are they doing? They take their positions, they said; and they have been doing this yesterday, and the day before]. In the case of the encomium, the passing of time is used by Maximian as an argument in favour of the old gods, who have been worshipped since a long way back.

Later in Metochites's encomium, Maximian tries to deter Nestor from engaging the gladiator Lyaeus in a duel by referring to a moment from the *Iliad*. In the Fifth Book of the *Iliad*, the one where Diomedes achieves his *aristeia*, after having shot him with an arrow that did not kill him, the Trojan archer Pandarus describes Diomedes thus to his fellow-warrior, Aeneas: θεός νυ τίς ἐστι κοτήεις[64] [you would think that he is an angry god]. Ending with the same phrase Metochites has Maximian say of Lyaeus: τόνδ' ἐρεθιζέμεν ἄνδρα δαίμων νύ τις ἐστὶ κοτήεις[65] [you would think that the man whom you provoke is some angry demon].

Further along in the story of St Demetrius's martyrdom, his servant Loupos is shown to perform miracles by using objects that belonged to the martyr. In this he is said to have reversed the ancient saying of the tragic poet Sophocles from his play *Antigone*. In the relevant passage the sage Tiresias says to Creon that there is no glory in killing the dead: 'ἀλλ' εἶκε τῷ θανόντι μηδ' ὀλωλότα κέντει· τὶς ἀλκὴ τὸν θανόντ' ἐπικτανεῖν;'[66] [but submit to the dead and do

not incite the fallen; what is the bravery in killing the dead?] In reversal of this, St Demetrius is glorified by healing and by bringing the dead to life, and killing no one but the servant of darkness (Satan).[67]

As one would expect, and like his teacher, Metochites, Nikephoros Gregoras makes extensive use of classical themes in his encomium. Not only classical influences are overwhelmingly apparent in it but also he gives more time to his classical allusions than most of the other authors. There are two kinds of links that he makes in that respect. The first and more obvious is the personalities from the ancient past who figure in his encomium. The second is the many words or phrases that he has picked from ancient Greek literature and has re-presented in his encomium with a twist to suit his topic.

From the personalities found in Gregoras's text, Alexander the Great is the most dominant. More space is dedicated to him than to any of the others and his role in the encomium is complex. He serves various purposes in different parts of Gregoras's argument and the comparison between Alexander and St Demetrius is quite an elaborate theme. For example, in discussing how pilgrims came from far afield to Thessalonica, Gregoras says that it is possible to have an affinity for something from outside one's own locality, just as Alexander who was from Macedonia had great admiration for the wisdom of the cynic philosopher, Diogenes who was from Sinope.[68] Gregoras even likened *himself* to Alexander, saying that as Alexander was worried at the achievements of Philip because he would take all the glory, Gregoras could have been overwhelmed at the skill of the previous encomiasts but he is not, because St Demetrius provides him with constant triggers for renewed praise:

> Ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου μὲν ἦν ἐκείνου τοῦ Μακεδόνος ἐπὶ τοῖς Φιλίππου τοῦ πατρὸς κατορθώμασιν ἄχθεσθαι καὶ δεδιέναι μή, πάντα ἐκείνου κατωρθωκότος, μηδὲν εἰς φιλοτιμίας αὐτῷ καταλίποιτο ἔνδειξιν, ἐμὲ δὲ τοῖς πρὶν εἰρηκόσιν οὐκ ἄν ποτ᾽ ἄχθεσθαι γένοιτο, ἅτε προειληφόσι τὰ πάντα, μηδὲν περὶ ὧν λέξοντες ἥκομεν καταλιποῦσιν ἄρρητον· ἀφθονία γὰρ ὑποθέσεων ἐνταυθοῖ προκείσεται ᾧ πρὸς βουλήσεως ἂν εἴη καὶ προθυμίας παντί, ἐν μηδενὶ καὶ μηδαμῇ τῶν κατὰ δύναμίν πως ἀμελεῖν. [69] [And also that certain Alexander of

> Macedonia was burdened by the successes of his father, Philip, and he feared that, with him achieving everything, there will be no chance left to him to show his love of honour, as for me, those who have spoken before me will not be a weight upon myself, as if they have anticipated everything without leaving anything unsaid about our subject. For there is a plethora of topics here for anyone who has every will and eagerness, and in no way neglects to do his best].

In the end of the encomium, Gregoras admits his failure to praise the saint sufficiently.[70] Modesty on the part of the encomiast is a common trait.

Other personalities that he mentions cover a wide range: the Roman general Crassus, the Cynic philosopher Diogenes, King Xerxes of Persia, King Philip II of Macedon, Queen Semiramis of Babylon, the Euripidian characters Orestes and Pylades, as well as the two Roman generals called Scipio: Scipio Africanus, the conqueror of Hannibal, and his adopted grandson Scipio Aemilianus Africanus. Gregoras in another instance compares Demetrius to Diogenes,[71] and also to Job: 'καὶ Ἰὼβ μέν ἐκεῖνον τὸν πάνυ, οὗ τὴν καρτερίαν ὁ πᾶς αἰὼν ἐκεῖθεν ὑμνεῖ, ἔτεσιν ὁ πολέμιος ἐμάστιζεν ὅλοις ἑπτὰ καὶ ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ σταδίῳ'[72] [and even the illustrious Job, whose patience every age exalts, the enemy (i.e. the devil) tortured for seven years, and out in the open air].

These personalities adorn the encomium of Gregoras with mythical glamour and make it stand out amongst the encomia in the rich echoes of the past that they evoke. Yet, as has been mentioned, this is not the only way in which Gregoras's interest in the classical world is demonstrated in this text. Even more so, it can be felt in the way he chooses his classical vocabulary. We will now turn to a detailed examination of specific classical references in Gregoras's encomium.

The word *φιλοτιμία* (*philotimia)* normally means the love of honour or distinction, thus having connotations of ambition. This is its use in the characterization of Themistocles by Plutarch 'καὶ γὰρ ἦν τῇ φύσει φιλοτιμότατος, εἰ δεῖ τεκμέρεσθαι διὰ τῶν ἀπομνημονευομάτων'[73] [and his was most ambitious in nature, as it is evident from the things said about him]. The story that Plutarch gives to show the extent of his ambition is that when Themistocles

was made admiral, he left all the tasks that had to be done and all the meetings till the day of his sailing, in order for his fellow citizens to see this and assume that he is a person of great importance. In *Iphigenia in Aulis*, Menelaus remarks that the prophet Calchas is motivated by his love of honour: 'φιλοτιμίᾳ μὲν ἐνέχεται, δεινῷ κακῷ' [74] [for his is held by his love of honour, a terrible evil]. That makes the two brothers, Menelaus and Agamemnon, fear him more. *Philotimia* is extensively mentioned by Aristotle in many of his works and most notably in his *Nicomachean Ethics*. On one of those instances he draws attention to the fact that most people, exactly because of *philotimia*, their love of honour, prefer to be loved than to love: οἱ πολλοὶ δὲ δοκοῦσι διὰ φιλοτιμίαν βούλεσθαι φιλεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλεῖν[75] [most people reckon that for love of honour they would rather be loved than love]. In the context of the civic life of Athens the word also took the meaning of one's willingness to pay for a public service, as can be seen in the oration of the Athenian rhetorician Demosthenes *Against Meidias*: 'οὐδὲ τὴν φιλοτιμίαν ἐκ τούτων κρίνειν, εἴ τις οἰκοδομεῖ λαμπρῶς ἢ θεραπαίνας κέκτηται πολλὰς ἢ σκεύη καλά'[76] [nor should one judge (his) public spirit from these things, whether he builds handsome houses, or whether he possesses many female helpers, or beautiful objects]. Plutarch uses the word with a similar meaning in the life of Crassus, who showed *philotimia* towards his guests.[77] Yet in some instances the word has another meaning, notably as in another work of Demosthenes, *On the Crown*, where it means excessive luxury: 'μηδεμιᾶς φιλοτιμίας μήτ᾽ ἰδίας μήτε δημοσίας ἀπολείπεσθαι'[78] [not foregoing any indulgence, neither private nor public]. It is in this latter sense that Gregoras uses it in his encomium. He argues that his contribution to the praise of St Demetrius, that is to say his encomium, is a worthwhile thing that should not be considered as superfluous, as an unnecessary luxury, that is, it should not be considered a *philotimia*.[79]

Another classical model that influenced the way in which Gregoras praised St Demetrius was ancient Greek words for religious festivals, pagan in their original sense. A word that stands out for referring to the month of St Demetrius's festival, which also appears in Harmenopoulos's encomium, is *ἱερομηνία* [holy month] (of which

more details will appear later). This is a word the ancient Greeks used to refer to periods of truce during holy months in which their sacred festivals took place. Pindar, for example, in one of his Nemean Odes in honour of Aristoclides from Aegina, winner in the contest of Pancratium in the Nemean Games, refers to the holy month of Nemea: 'ἐν ἱερομηνίᾳ Νεμεάδι'[80] [in the holy month of Nemea]. Thucydides in his *History* refers to *hieromenia* twice. First in Book Three, he narrates in the form of speeches by both parties how the Thebans attacked the Plataeans in time of σπονδαῖς καὶ ἱερομηνίαι [libations and holy treaty of peace] and then in Book Five he reveals the differing attitudes between the Spartans and the Argives in relation to the attack of Epidaurus in view of the approach of the month of Carneus, a holy month for the Dorians.[81] The word finds frequent use in the work of Demosthenes and, furthermore, it can be found in Appian, *The Civil Wars*, Book 5, where Octavian accepts an ovation and a yearly celebration (*hieromenia*) of his victories.[82]

In relation to the whole month of October leading to the saint's name day, Gregoras uses one more word, resonant of the myth of the sacrifice of Iphigenia. The word προτέλεια (*proteleia*), which means the preliminary rites and sacrifices before an important ceremony, is used darkly in the tragic play *Agamemnon* to signify the sacrifice of the daughter of the eponymous hero, Iphigenia, at the outset of the departure of the Greek ships for Troy 'προτέλεια ναῶν'[83] [a preliminary sacrifice before the ships]. The word also denotes a bathing ritual before marriage as described by Plutarch in his *Moralia*.[84] A reference to such preliminary rituals can also be found in Plato's *Laws*.[85] The bathing theme takes a darker dimension in the ritual murder of Agamemnon in Aeschylus's *Agamemnon* by his wife in his bath, mirroring the sacrifice of Iphigenia. Euripides also deals with Iphigenia's sacrifice in his play *Iphigenia in Aulis*. In the play Clytemnestra enquires about the preliminary libations (*proteleia*) to take place before the alleged wedding between Iphigenia and Achilles, for it is on that pretext that the young girl was led to Aulis.[86] The association of *proteleia* with marriage is obvious in the fact that it was also called προγάμεια [rituals before the wedding]. In Gregoras the word refers to the personal preparations and spiritual ablutions that were customary for the citizens of Thessalonica in order for their souls

to be ready for St Demetrius's day, as if they were coming to a spiritual wedding.

As Gregoras likens the festival of St Demetrius with the seasons of nature, and especially with spring and summer (see later chapter), to enhance his metaphor he chooses two images from Aristotle's disciple and his successor in the Peripatetic school, the natural and moral philosopher Theophrastus. Theophrastus's botanical works *Enquiry into Plants* and *On the Causes of Plants* were very influential in the development of medieval science. In his book *On the Causes of Plants* he discusses how plants should be best grown and managed. Their nurture seems to offer here a metaphor for the Christian soul. The relevant passages come from the section where he discusses the growth of the vine. The first reference relates to the growth of new fruit (νέωτα): 'τῇ γὰρ ἀμπέλῳ τότε συμβαίνει πρὸς αὔξησιν ὁρμᾶν τῶν τε παρόντων καρπῶν, καὶ τῶν βλαστῶν ἐν οἷς ἄρχεται γονεύειν τὸν εἰς νέωτα καρπόν. ἐὰν οὖν ὁ καρπὸς μὴ παρεθῇ, καλῶς γονεύσει'[87] [and then it happens to the vine to have the urge to grow the existing fruit and the shoots on which it starts to grow the new fruit. And if the fruit is not neglected, it will grow well]. The newness of the fruit Gregoras turns into the new hope people feel every spring in relation to agricultural pursuits. The second example refers to the best maintenance of the vine in order for its fruit to be at its optimum (καρποῦ φοράν): 'τῆς γὰρ ἀμπέλου τεμνομένης ἐξ ἴσου πρὸς τε τὴν ἕξιν ἑαυτῆς καὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ καρποῦ φοράν, πολυχρόνιον ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀγαθὴν διὰ τέλους'[88] [and the vine which is equally pruned with regard to its condition and to its fruit-bearing, will have a long life and will be good to the end]. So here the word *phora* does not mean direction but bearing. This bearing of fruit in Gregoras refers to the collection of fruit that rewards in the summer those who have worked hard all year, and by extension rewards the Christians who have been preparing themselves in anticipation for the saint's festival.

Gregoras describes a very popular festival in which multitudes gather eagerly waiting to participate. To emphasize this he uses the word *συρρέω* [to flow together],[89] a word that should normally be used for liquids but which already had been used metaphorically by ancient authors to relate to the gathering of crowds. The word finds

such a use in many ancient authors, amongst which are Herodotus, Plato and Isocrates.[90]

When talking about the myrrh of St Demetrius, Gregoras could not resist reference to the story told by Plutarch in his biography of Phocion. In the story, Phocion's rival, the Athenian orator Demades, states that rumours of the death of Alexander the Great must be wrong, because if the man had died the whole world would smell of his corpse: 'Πρώτου δὲ ᾽Αθηναίοις ᾽Ασκληπιάδου τοῦ ῾Ιππάρχου τεθνάναι προσαγγείλαντος ᾽Αλέξανδρον, ὁ μὲν Δημάδης ἐκέλευε μὴ προσέχειν· πάλαι γὰρ ἂν ὅλην ὄζειν νεκροῦ τὴν οἰκουμένην'[91] [And when first of the Athenians Asclepiades, son of Hipparchus, announced that Alexander had died, Demades was urging people not to pay attention; for had he died, the whole world would be smelling of the corpse]. In a reversal of this idea of bad smell, Gregoras says that the world smells of the fragrance of St Demetrius's myrrh forever.[92]

In describing the contest of the body and soul of St Demetrius while in captivity, Gregoras uses a word from Arrian, *ἀμφίστομος* [double-mouthed],[93] which describes the way a phalanx may be laid for battle, having two fronts as opposed to one. In such a way St Demetrius is shown to fight for Christ, keeping up the battle on two fronts, both physically and spiritually.[94] In Homer an equivalent expression is used but in its literal sense, that of a double-edged sword (φάσγανον ἄμφηκες). In Book Ten of the *Iliad*, Thrasymedes lends Diomedes his double-edged sword, because his was left at his tent. The episode takes place in the context of helping him to prepare for raiding the Trojan camp during the night, while accompanied by Odysseus.[95]

In portraying the bloodthirstiness of Maximian, Gregoras has him throwing the body of St Demetrius in the legendary well (of which more in another chapter) as opposed to burying it on the ground, thus leaving it prey to the birds.[96] The passage has a ring of classical imagery as both the opening of the *Iliad* and of *Antigone* are marked by a similar image of bleakness. The first seven, and probably most famous, lines of the *Iliad* establish the theme of the epic, which is the wrath of Achilles. This wrath is portrayed as a destructive force which led the souls of many heroes to Hades and their bodies prey to

the dogs and vultures.[97] A similar image emerges in Sophocles where Antigone discusses with her sister Ismene how King Creon has given their one brother, Eteocles, all the honours of burial, while the other, Polyneikes, has been left unburied, shamed, and defenceless prey to the birds, so that he can be eaten.[98]

Gregoras uses another significant moment from *Antigone* when he paraphrases Antigone's sister, Ismene, who states meekly that it is pointless to try and do something beyond one's power: 'τὸ γὰρ περισσὰ πράσσειν οὐκ ἔχει νοῦν οὐδένα'[99] [for doing more than one can, makes no sense at all]. This is a point of decision making in the tragedy. Antigone is going to disobey the authorities and bury her brother, despite the death punishment attached to such action, while Ismene will be obedient and take no part in the burial. Gregoras uses Ismene's phrase to show how the fame of St Demetrius is overwhelming. The person said to do more than is in his capacity in the encomium is Maximian, who cannot stop the glory of St Demetrius from being known to the world.[100]

Coming to the end of his encomium, Gregoras apologizes for not being competent enough in his praise of St Demetrius. He likens himself to an *ἡμεροδρόμος* [day-runner].[101] In antiquity this term described somebody who had to run all day in order to deliver an important message. Such messengers are mentioned in Herodotus, Plato's *Protagoras*, the geographer Pausanias's *Description of Greece*, and Diodorus of Sicily.[102] The *himerodromos* mentioned by Herodotus is the Athenian Pheidippides who ran from Marathon to Athens to report the victory over the Persians and then allegedly dropped dead. In antiquity *himerodromoi* did not participate in athletic contests. The three categories of runners in the ancient games were the stadiodromoi, diaulodromoi and dolichodromoi. The *diaulos*, one of the measures used by the ancient Greeks for their games, is referred to by Gregoras in his encomium as a metaphor for the commitment with which the citizens of Thessalonica worshipped St Demetrius, as if participating in an athletic contest.[103] Gregoras also draws attention to the fact that he wrote the encomium after being asked, which means that the blame for failure is not his. He uses the metaphor of *διφρηλασία* (*diphrêlasia*), an ancient Greek form of charioteering to support his point. It will become apparent how, after seeing how

διφρηλασία was referred to in the classics. The contest with chariots is said by the lyric poet Pindar to have been given to men by one of the most imposing Greek heroes, Hercules, upon his ascension to Olympus. This tale can be found in the poet's Third Olympian Ode to Theron of Acragas, winner of the chariot race. Charioteering played an important part in ancient games, and Pindar refers to more charioteers, namely Amphytrion, the father of Hercules, in his Ninth Pythian Ode in honour of Telesicrates of Cyrene, winner of the hoplite race. Pindar calls Castor and Iolaus the strongest charioteers in his First Isthmian Ode.[104] A very dramatic scene in which a charioteer is described to fall from the chariot to his death is described in Sophocles's *Electra* where a made-up story of Orestes dying in this way serves the purposes of the plot.[105] This passage shows how dramatic and how fatal the failure of the charioteer can be. Gregoras says that for the failure of a charioteer one must blame not him but those who put him on the chariot.[106]

The lawyer Constantine Harmenopoulos is a user of the classics in a different manner from Metochites and Gregoras. He uses his classical echoes and references with a light touch, not dwelling on them but weaving them into his encomium seamlessly, as his oration is anchored in the festival and his surroundings.

One example is the way he talks about the Colossus of Rhodes, the great statue that used to stand astride the island's main harbour and one of the Seven Wonders of the World. According to the chronicler Theophanes Confessor, the statue had finally been destroyed 1,360 years after its erection in 652/3 by the Arab general Mauias.[107] Harmenopoulos was well aware of that for he contrasts the transitory nature of the Colossus with the eternal appeal of the church of the Acheiropoietos in Thessalonica.[108] Curiously, a similar use of the Colossus can be found not in a Greek but in a Latin writer. The Roman Stoic philosopher, dramatist, and adviser of Nero, Seneca the Younger, referred to it in his moral essay *De Consolatione ad Polybium*, in order to underline the transitory nature of the (overrated) achievements of the ancient world.[109] It is extremely unlikely, of course, that Harmenopoulos would have been aware of this passage.

There are other examples of Harmenopoulos's 'background' classicism. In the process of discussing the architectural merit of the church of the Acheiropoietos, for example, he juxtaposes the knowledge possessed by specialists to the opinions of the general public in a way reminiscent of the teachings of Socrates: 'τῶν γὰρ πολλῶν ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἥκιστα μεμνῆσθαι δεῖ'[110] [for it is deserving to remember those who are above hoi polloi]. The distinction between the many and the few is made here in terms of the latter group's knowledge. This is the subject of an entire Platonic dialogue, *Charmides*, where the nature of knowledge is examined.[111] The dialogue is mostly remembered for its discussion of the Delphic inscription 'Know thyself' but it is its discussion of expert knowledge that is of interest here.

He brings another juxtaposition to his oration, the one referring to perceptions of the state of the soul in afterlife in Christian and in pagan thought. Christians, he says, believe that the soul is fed by the word of God, while pagans that it eats *ambrosia* and drinks *nectar*, the food and drink respectively of the Olympian gods: 'καὶ θείῳ ῥήματι τεθραμμένον, ᾧ ψυχὰς μάλιστα θεοφιλεῖς ἀντ᾽ ἀμβροσίας πιστεύομεν ἄνωθεν καὶ νέκταρος ἐστιᾶσθαι'[112] [and fed with the word of God, with which we believe that in heaven the souls that desire God are fed by, as opposed to ambrosia and nectar]. Location-specific references like this can be very effective, although Harmenopoulos does not specifically name Olympus in this example. Mount Olympus is named in another passage, when Harmenopoulos describes the hymns sung in the Acheiropoietos: 'οὐκ ἐκ γῆς ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ ᾽Ολύμπου δοκούντων ᾄδεσθαι'[113] [seeming as if being sung not from the earth but from Olympus].

There is another instance where he identifies an ancient Greek institution with a very strong resonance. The institution in question is the prytaneion, the council of executive officers in the cities of ancient Greece. The most famous amongst them is the Prytaneion of Athens, not least because it is remembered for the bitterly sarcastic line in Plato's *Apology* where Socrates during his trial requests to be fed there at the state's expense, a high honour reserved for the most distinguished citizens.[114] The word is used metaphorically in the Platonic dialogue *Protagoras* for Athens to denote a seat of wisdom

and Nikephoros Gregoras uses it for Constantinople in his *History*.[115] For Harmenopoulos, the Virgin Mary was 'τὸ τῶν θείων τε καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων χαρίτων πρυτανεῖον', the prytaneion of the divine and human graces.[116] Another example of Harmenopoulos relating classical themes directly to his subject is when he describes the ceremonies in the Acheiropoietos church that surround them. In doing ἵς οὖν τοῖς ἐνταύθα μέλεσι τὴν διάνοιαν οὐκ ἐκπλήττεται;'[117] [Who does not feel amazed by the intellect of the melodies here?]. He also likens the hymns to St Demetrius to the beauty of the mythical song of the Sirens in the *Odyssey*.[118]

These references to Mount Olympus, the prytaneion and the sirens show that Harmenopoulos was acquainted with classical history and vocabulary. He also brings in echoes of ancient language, drawn from a sound acquaintance with the classics. For example, he links St Demetrius directly to his Saviour via a classical turn of phrase. He calls St Demetrius a θεράπων (*therapon*) of Christ, an epithet famously used in Homer to describe Patroclus's relationship to Achilles: 'τῷ γενναίῳ τούτου θεράποντι'[119] [of this brave servant of His]. This also intimates a closeness of relationship between the saint and Christ similar to that between the two Homeric heroes. He also refers to St Demetrius as hero: 'θεῖον ἐν μάρτυσιν ἥρω'[120] [the divine hero amongst the martyrs].

The most striking example of all is an echo of Plutarch. Harmenopoulos says that St Demetrius had to hide from his persecutors in a place called Kataphyge: 'τόπον δὲ τῇ ὀργῇ - κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον - διδόντα'[121] [giving place to anger, as it was written]. Harmenopoulos's phrase *τόπον δίδωμι τῇ ὀργῇ* is also found in Plutarch's *Ethics*:

> οὕτως οὔτε γάμος οὔτε φιλία μετ᾽ ὀργῆς ἀνεκτόν· ἀλλὰ χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ μέθη κοῦφόν ἐστιν. ὁ γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ νάρθηξ ἱκανὸς κολαστῆς τοῦ μεθύοντος, ἂν μὴ προσγενόμενος ὁ θυμὸς ὠμηστὴν καὶ μαινόλην ἀντὶ λυαίου καὶ χορείου ποιήσῃ τὸν ἄκρατον. (…) Δεῖ δὲ μήτε παίζοντας αὐτῇ διδόναι τόπον, ἔχθραν γὰρ ἐπάγει τῇ φιλοφροσύνῃ· μήτε κοινολογούμενους, φιλονεικίαν γὰρ ἐκ φιλολογίας ἀπεργάζεται[122] [Thus, neither marriage nor friendship is bearable with rage; but without rage, even drunkenness is light to bear. For the reed of the god is an able avenger of

> the drunken, if the oncoming anger does not make the excessive drinker an eater of raw meat and a frenzied man, as opposed to (only) a Dionysian savage and a dancer… So do not give place (to anger) even in jest, for it makes friendliness into hatred; nor when discussing matters of common interest, for it contrives strife from philology].

The passage in Plutarch is fascinating for its portrayal of anger and its dangers. Indeed the phrase *τόπον δίδωμι τῇ ὀργῇ* is also used by St Paul in his Epistle to the Romans: 'Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.'[123] In this context, however, Plutarch's words are even more appropriate, in that he uses the epithet *lyaeus*, another name for the ancient god of wine Dionysus. Literally, the word means a savage and was the given name of the champion gladiator who fought St Nestor in the legend of St Demetrius's martyrdom. It is highly likely that Harmenopoulos was drawn to the above passage precisely because of this epithet even though he himself does not use the word *lyaeus* in his encomium. It is extremely unlikely that the audience would have identified such a remote allusion and one suspects that this passage has been inserted for Harmenopoulos's own benefit rather than that of his hearers.

Nicholas Kavasilas makes abundant use of classical language. Classical figures, like Plato, Aristotle, Euripides, and the mythical Orpheus appear in Kavasilas's first encomium, as does Socrates.[124] In his second encomium he described St Demetrius in the guise of a Homeric warrior.[125] In his third encomium in particular he used numerous Homeric epithets for St Demetrius.[126] His fellow Byzantines are called Achaeans rather than Hellenes, a word used by Homer to denote all of the Greek army: 'σύμπαντες Ἀχαιῶν'[127] [all of the Achaioi, i.e. Greeks]. Even Christ Himself is awarded a Homeric epithet by being called *Olympian*: 'Χριστὸς ὀλύμπιος'.[128] In another example, Kavasilas refers not to St Nestor but another of Demetrius's acolytes and fellow martyrs, St Loupos, reflecting a variant in the legends. St Loupos is the 'θεράπων' [i.e. squire] of St Demetrius (which is reminiscent of the relationship between Patroclus and Achilles). To have both St Loupos and St Nestor present would

perhaps compromise the ideal of the Homeric metaphor, hence the absence of the latter.[129]

It is intriguing to note that Biblical references are completely absent from Kavasilas's third encomium. The imagery is all drawn from Greek mythology. In his second encomium, there is not much more than one mention of King Solomon.[130] In the light of this, it seems that we should classify Kavasilas's encomia as heavily classicist. But things are not quite that simple. Kavasilas's thought eludes classification and needs further study to be fully appreciated.

This brings us to the last author to be discussed in the context of classical influence, Demetrius Chrysoloras, who could be characterised as the most effective in using ancient models creatively. This last section will concentrate on one particular passage from his encomium, the lengthy, intense and theatrical discussion between St Demetrius and the Roman emperor Maximian who ordered his martyrdom. This passage is slighted by Laourdas precisely because of its debt to classical models.[131] That judgement will be disputed here.

The oration begins conventionally, for Chrysoloras was wise enough to intersperse his encomium with a number of core Byzantine values. An example is the transcendental objective of gaining the next life and not this one, which can be found in the description of St Demetrius as a young man, where Chrysoloras lists his many virtues. Above all he praises the saint because 'κατεῖχε γὰρ αὐτὸν οὐ πλοῦτος, οὐ δόξα, οὐ συγγένεια, οὐδὲν ἕτερον οἷς πολλοὶ περὶ τὸν βίον ἐξηπατήθησαν'[132] [(because) he was neither possessed of wealth, nor glory, nor kinship, nor any of the other things by which many were deceived in relation to living]. The freedom of the saint from the things of this world is stressed throughout Chrysoloras's encomium. The saint's uncompromising purity is linked to his power to save. The implication is, that with such a stainless patron, it is no wonder that his home town, Thessalonica, achieved victory on several occasions. This is said to have been: 'τῷ τοῦ μάρτυρος κράτει'[133] [due to the strength (*kratos*) of the martyr].

Similarly, there are some remarks about Demetrius as the protector of Thessalonica. The salvation of the city of Thessalonica is linked by Chrysoloras with the healing of both the souls and the

bodies of the faithful. The notion behind this metaphor is that the γένος will be saved only if it is whole physically and spiritually. St Demetrius, a healing as well as a military saint, is portrayed here as the ἰατρὸς ἄριστος (*iatros aristos*, perfect physician) for the soul and the body:

> σὺ πολλάκις τὴν παροῦσαν πόλιν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ἐρρύσω τῶν ἀλλοφύλων καὶ παντοίων ἐγένου τῶν νοσημάτων ἰατρὸς ἄριστος καὶ τὸ γένος ἡμῶν ἠλέησας· διὸ σοῦ δεόμεθα ἔτι καὶ νῦν, ἀνάστησον αὐτὸ κείμενον καὶ βοηθείας δεόμενον ἐλευθέρωσον καὶ βοήθησον ἀσθενοῦντι, χειμαζόμενον ἐν ἀκυμάντῳ λιμένι στῆσον, πηγνύμενον ἔτι πυρὶ βαρβάρων, διάλυσον εὐκρασίᾳ σου, καὶ θυμῷ καιόμενον αὐτῶν, θερμῇ σου δρόσῳ θεράπευσον, καὶ πάντα ποίησον ἐν θεραπείᾳ ψυχῶν ἅμα καὶ σωμάτων ἡμῶν (…)[134] [you have delivered the present city from the hands of the people of other tribes many times, and you have become an excellent physician for all kinds of ailments and you have taken pity on our own people. Therefore we plead to you then and now, resurrect the country of our people that is laid (here) and is in need of help, free it and help it in its weakness, set it to pass the winter in a wave-free harbour, and as it has been hardened by the fire of the savages, reconcile (it) by your agreeable temperament, and what has been burning as a result of their rage, attend with your warm coolness, and do everything in attendance of our souls and jointly of our bodies (…)].

The 'wave-free harbour' and the dangers of the sea in general were common metaphors in Byzantine literature, frequently for indicating – according to the context – the perilous nature of physical danger, heresy, or sin.[135]

Finally, Chrysoloras gave his audience a fairly standard account of Demetrius's martyrdom. As the saint is taken off to prison, Chrysoloras says that he was not only ready to die but even rather disappointed that in the first instance he was sent to a dungeon and not to meet his death straight away:

> Καὶ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ παστὸν ἤγετο, ἐδυσχέραινε δὲ μόνον ὅτι μὴ τάχιον ἤθλησε καὶ αἰτιᾶτο λίαν αὐτὸν ἐξελθόντα σταδίου πέρας ἀστεφάνωτον ἔχοντα. Οὕτως ἦν ἀλγηδόνων ἅμα καὶ θανάτου καταφρονῶν καὶ εἰκότως· οἱ γὰρ λειτουργοὶ Θεοῦ καὶ γνήσιοι τὴν διάνοιαν ἐπιμελῶς ἠκόνται οὐ μικρὸν τὸ παραμικρὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Θεοῦ γε νομίζοντες· ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως οἰκονομίᾳ χρῆται κἂν τούτῳ Χριστός, ἵνα καὶ ἄλλους δι᾽ αυτοῦ προσλάβῃ τοὺς μάρτυρας· ὃ προειδὼς καὶ ὁ

μάρτυς ἡσύχαζεν εὐχαριστῶν τὸν Θεὸν.[136] [And he went there as if to a bridal chamber. He was only dissatisfied that he did not excel in martyrdom sooner, and he wondered quite a lot about having exited the stadium without the garland of sacrifice. That is how much he despised the various sufferings and the prospect of death, and naturally so. For the agents of God and those who are true in spirit go to great lengths to acknowledge their faith in God in every opportunity but Christ makes use of his divine economy, so that he may bring other martyrs through him. Having foreseen this, the martyr was at peace and was giving thanks to God].

These are all elements that are common to the encomia.

What distinguishes Chrysoloras's encomium, however, is that over half of it is given over to the confrontation between St Demetrius and Maximian. It is written in the form of a dialogue, a genre that evolved in the classical world and was used by authors such as Plato and Xenophon. Yet Chrysoloras is not slavishly imitating the ancient form here. Unlike his ancient models, Chrysoloras's dialogue is not conducted between close and cordial friends who treat each other as equals in the spirit of exchanging opinions for edification and pleasure. The dynamic in the encounter between Maximian and St Demetrius is rather different. Although there is familiarity between them, the saint is summoned before his emperor to justify his actions and his life is on the line. The conversation is not in the context of learning about the nature of things but part of the process of a formal hearing. This lends intensity to the dialogue, which is successfully captured by Chrysoloras.

Their dialogue centres on the nature of God and the representation of gods and goddesses by ancient Greek sculptors and poets, as opposed to the Christian God. It is stated that St Demetrius was well-acquainted (γνώριμος) with Maximian, who had made him *anthypatos* or proconsul of Greece.[137] This is useful for the audience of the encomium, as the nature of what is to follow presupposes a dialogue between people who have known each other. The scene starts with Maximian's disbelief at the news that St Demetrius did not worship the Roman gods and his protest that Demetrius's faith is pure insanity: 'Καὶ ὁ τύραννος «ἐμάνεις»[138], λέγει, «Δημήτριε (…)»'[139] [And the tyrant says: 'You are filled with frenzy, Demetrius (…)']. One can feel the rage of the emperor coming through the pages

of the dialogue. Next the saint declares his Christian faith and his fearlessness in the face of martyrdom, for he cares not for his body but for his soul. For example, when Chrysoloras mentions that the emperor heard that St Demetrius had become a Christian, he uses appropriate phrasing to show the working of his mind: 'οὗ γενομένου, ὁ βασιλεὺς ἤρετο, εἰ μὴ λατρεύοι τὰ εἴδωλα καὶ θεούς, ἀλλά τινα καινὸν σέβεται λεγόμενον θεόν'[140] [that having been done, the king asked if he did not worship the idols and the gods, but instead he had reverence for some new so-called god]. In his response, St Demetrius is described to be 'γενναῖος καὶ λόγῳ καὶ βλέμματι'[141] [brave in both words and gaze]. This opening of the scene is alive with the personalities of the two men. The disbelief of Maximian at what he hears from his officer is portrayed skilfully, and at the same time St Demetrius appears strong and confident in his faith. The element of the battle of wills is introduced by the remark about him quoted above, this of being bold both in words and in the way his eyes meet those of Maximian.

This leads to the main part of the dialogue, the discussion of the nature of deity. Chrysoloras places into the mouth of Maximian the argument that the beauty of the statues of the pagan gods proves their divinity in the following extraordinary passage:

> τί φὴς περὶ τῶν μεγάλων θεῶν; οὐδὲν ἡγῇ τὸν Κρόνον καὶ τὸν Ἑρμῆν, ἢ τὸν Δία καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα, ἢ τὸν Ἄρεα καὶ τὸν Ἥφαιστον; καὶ εἰ μὴ τούτους, αἰδέσθητι τὰς θεάς, αἷς θαυμαστὰ μὲν ὀνόματα, πολὺ δὲ θαυμαστότερον ἡ πολιτεία. Λέγω τὴν Ἥραν, ἧς τὴν κόμην Εὐφράνωρ μετ᾽ εὐλαβείας ἐχρώσατο, τὴν Κασάνδραν, ἧς τοὺς ὄφρυας ὁ Πολύγνωτος, τὴν Ροξάνην, ἧς τὰ χείλη μετ᾽ ἐπιμελείας Ἀετίων ἐποίει, τὴν Πακάτην, ἧς τὸ σῶμα πᾶν Ἀπελλῆς, τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, ἧς μᾶλλον τοῦ αὐτοῦ ποιήματος ἐπετέρπετο Πραξιτέλης, τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν, ἣν ὡς μέγα τῶν αὐτοῦ πλασμάτων Ἀλκαμένης ἱστόρησε, τὴν Σωσάνδραν, ἐν ᾗ Κάλαμις ἐφρόνει ξένα, τὴν Λημνίαν, ᾗ καὶ τὸ ἴδιον ὄνομα Φειδίας ἐπέγραφε, τὴν Καλλιόπην, τὴν Κλειώ, τὴν Πολύμνιαν, ἃς Λυκῖνος ὑπερβάλλοντως ἐτίμησε, τὴν Ρέαν, τὴν Ἄρτεμιν καὶ ἄλλας τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἡμιθέων πολλάς, ἃς Ζεῦξις καὶ Παράσιος καὶ Σωκράτης καὶ Ὅμηρος καὶ πάντες ἄλλοι τῶν ποιητῶν ἐπαινοῦσιν ἐκπληττόμενοι καὶ θαυμάζουσιν· αὐτὸς δὲ πῶς τολμᾷς ἁπάντων καταφρονεῖν;[142] [What do you say about the great gods? Do you not believe in Cronos and Hermes or Zeus and Apollo or Ares and Hephaestus? If not in

these, you should have reverence for the goddesses, whose names are wondrous, but much more admirable is their life story. I am talking of Hera whose hair Euphranor[143] touched with colour with deference, Cassandra, whose eyebrows Polygnotus [depicted],[144] Roxana[145] whose lips Aetion[146] made with carefulness, Pancaste[147] whose entire body Apelles [painted],[148] Aphrodite in whom Praxiteles[149] rather delighted as his own work, Athena whom Alcamenes[150] recounted as a great creation of his, Sosandra [Aphrodite] whom Calamis[151] regarded as a guest, Lemnian [Athena] whose own name Phidias[152] inscribed upon her, Calliope, Clio, Polymnia, all of whom Lycinus[153] honoured with excelling zeal, Rea, Artemis, and many others from the goddesses and the demi-goddesses, whom Zeuxis,[154] and Parrhassius[155] and Socrates and Homer and all others amongst the poets praise in their amazement and admire. How do you dare yourself to disdain all of these?]

The enumeration of so many ancient gods, artists and works of art in this section is striking and it is clear that there is some classical model here. What it is will be discussed shortly.

It follows that if St Demetrius did not agree with Maximian's position, he would have to face the emperor's anger. The threat with which Maximian menaces St Demetrius is intriguing too: 'ἵνα μὴ μόνον ἀπολέσῃς τὸ ζῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σὺν τοῖς δαίμοσι κολασθῇς καὶ χλευασθῇς ἐπὶ θαυμαστῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ παντί γε στρατεύματι'[156] [so that not only will you lose your life, but also you will be punished by means of the demons and you will be mocked by the admirable emperor and all the army]. In response to Maximian's threat, Demetrius gives a similar speech showing an intimate knowledge of the ancient gods, which of course is something one would have expected of the historical-mythical person of St Demetrius. He speaks eloquently of the association of deities with natural powers and bodies, and he poses the question of what is the nature of mortality in bringing up the concept of demi-gods. The undertones of natural philosophy here, especially the reference to the oneness of natural power, also point to Chrysoloras's comprehensive classical knowledge:

οὐ καλοῦσι τὴν μὲν γῆν Δήμητραν, κόρην, Πλούτωνα; τὴν δὲ θάλασσαν, Ποσειδῶνα καὶ δαίμονας ἐναλίους; οὐ τιμῶσιν ἀέρα μὲν ὡς τὴν Ἥραν, τὸ δὲ πῦρ ὡς τὸν Ἥφαιστον; καὶ τὸν μὲν ἥλιον ὡς Ἀπόλλωνα, τὴν δὲ σελήνην ὡς Ἄρτεμιν, καὶ τὸν μὲν Ἑωσφόρον ὡς Ἀφροδίτην, ὡς Ἑρμῆν δὲ τὸν στίλβοντα; οὐ ταῦτα πάντα τῶν

ἀψύχων καὶ ἀνεστίων καὶ τοῦ ζῶντος Χριστοῦ μου ποιήματα, οὐ τοῖς μὲν ὅλα στοιχεῖα, τοῖς δὲ τὸ ἓν ὡς θεὸν ἐσεβάσθησαν; τί δὲ τὰ τῶν ἡμιθέων; πῶς οἱ αὐτοὶ θνητοὶ τε καὶ ἀθάνατοι ἅμα; Καὶ τί λέγω ταῦτα; ὅπου ξύλα καὶ λίθους, χρυσὸν τε καὶ ἄργυρον καὶ τὰς παραπλησίους ὕλας μορφώσαντες λατρεύουσιν ὡς θεοὺς, οἳ καὶ ζωγραφίαν τιμᾶν ἐθέλουσιν ὡς θεὸν, ἧς πλαστικὴ καὶ δημιουργία χειρῶν ἀνθρώποις τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα;[157] [Do they not call the Earth Demeter, [her] Daughter [Persephone] and Pluto? The Sea, Poseidon and deities of the Sea? Do they not honour Air as Hera and Fire as Hephaestus? And the Sun as Apollo and the Moon as Artemis, and the Bringer of Light as Aphrodite, and the Shiny One as Hermes?[158] Are they not all soulless and devoid of altars, and creations of my own living Christ? Are they not all just particles and do they not all respect the One as God? And what of the demi-gods? How can the same persons be mortal and immortal at the same time? And what, I say, are these things? Wherever they have made things of wood, stone, gold and silver, and similar materials, they worship [them] as gods. Do those people want to honour painting as a god who in turn is a plastic art and the creation and achievement of human hands?].

In stating fearlessly that the gods and goddesses are τοῦ ζῶντος Χριστοῦ μου ποιήματα[159] [creations of my living Christ], Demetrius uses the intimate μου next to the name of Christ, a clever touch by Chrysoloras to portray St Demetrius's intimate relationship with his Saviour.

Following this impressive display, Chrysoloras has the saint give a bold declaration of the Christian faith, which is also carried in direct speech. With it the saint declares his dissassociation from pagan beliefs and his willingness to die. His reference to the goodness of the Christian God is made in juxtaposition to the volatile natures of the ancient gods, and their quarrels:

ᾎλλ᾽ ἡμῖν ἴσθι τοῖς χριστιανοῖς, εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ περ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁπλοῦς καὶ ἀγαθὸς ὅλος καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ ποτὲ στασιῶδες ἢ ὅμοιον· αὐτὸς ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ φαινόμενα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα· ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ γῆς ἁπάσης γενομένης ἁμαρτίας ἀνάπλεω οὐδεὶς ἠδύνατο στῆσαι τὸ πάθος, αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου σάρκα λαβὼν καὶ γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος, πολλὰ παθὼν ἀνέστη καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἔσωσεν· αὐτὸν ἐγὼ καὶ πάντες λατρεύομεν ὡς χριστιανοί· αὐτὸν δοξάζω καὶ σέβομαι, αὐτῷ πιστεύω καὶ μόνῳ καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μάλα φιλοτίμως ἀποθανοῦμαι· θεούς σου δὲ καὶ θεὰς ἀναθεματίζω καὶ ἀποβάλλομαι·

ποίει τοίνυν ἃ ἄν σοι φαίνηται δίκαια[160] [But to us Christians there is one God the Father, from whom the Son and the Spirit [come]. He is singular and all-good and nothing in him is capricious or the like. He made these things and they are only manifestations of him, and he also made the ministering spirits. Because there was sin all over the earth and no one could stand the suffering, the Son of God Himself taking flesh from the Holy Virgin and becoming man, after having suffered many things, rose from the dead and delivered mankind. I myself and all of us as Christians revere Him. It is Him I glorify and respect, in Him alone I have my faith and for His sake I am very willing to die with love of honour. Your gods and goddesses, I anathematize and throw off me and you may act in any way that may seem just to you].

These words bring the exchange between the emperor and the saint to an end. Maximian vows that Demetrius will experience his might and Demetrius responds that he will overcome it by the might of Christ.[161]

There is no doubt that the dialogue between Maximian and Demetrius stands out starkly from the rest of the encomium in terms of style and content. There is a good reason for that. As Laourdas pointed out, it is clearly modelled on one identifiable work of ancient Greek literature: the *Imagines* or *Essays in Portraiture* of Lucian of Samosata (c.120–180).[162] The *Imagines* is a rare example of an encomium in dialogue form. Probably written in Antioch between 162 and 166 AD, it praises the physical beauty and virtue of Panthea of Smyrna, the mistress of Emperor Lucius Verus (130–169 AD), co-emperor of Marcus Aurelius, and the adopted son of Emperor Hadrian. The dialogue is in two parts, the first concerned with the physical loveliness of Panthea and the second with her unsurpassed goodness and humanity. The two characters of the dialogue are Lycinus and Polystratus. In the first part Lycinus, who has caught sight of her and wants to describe her loveliness to Polystratus, makes a verbal portrait of her physical beauty. In the second part, Polystratus, who appears to know Panthea, makes a similar portrait of her virtue. To construct these portraits they employ many known works and techniques from sculptors, painters, poets, and philosophers of the ancient world. They use them to synthesize representations of different parts of her body, endeavouring to find the most perfect example for each. They do the same in listing her virtues.

The influence of the *Imagines* on Chrysoloras's encomium is not difficult to discern. Maximian specifically alludes to Lycinus in enumerating those who had depicted the gods, a direct, if unacknowledged citation of Lucian.[163] Secondly, Maximian's list of gods and artists so closely parallels Lucian's that it cannot possibly be a coincidence. As an example, take the following passage from the *Imagines*, spoken by Lycinus:

> Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν μύθον ἤκουσας, ὃν λέγουσιν οἱ ἐπιχώριοι περὶ αὐτῆς, ὡς ἐρασθείη τις τοῦ ἀγάλματος καὶ λαθὼν ὑπολειφθεὶς ἐν ἱερῷ συγγένοιτο, ὡς δυνατὸν ἀγάλματι. τοῦτο μέντοι ἄλλως ἱστορείσθω. σὺ δὲ - ταύτην γάρ, ὡς φής, εἶδες - ἴθι μοὶ καὶ τόδε ἀπόκριναι, εἰ καὶ τὴν ἐν κήποις Ἀθήνησι τὴν Ἀφροδίτην Ἀλκαμένους ἑώρακας;[164]
> [Well, have you also heard the story that the natives tell about it (Praxiteles's Aphrodite of Cnidus) – that someone fell in love with the statue, was left behind unnoticed in the temple, and embraced it to the best of his endeavours? But, no matter about that. Since you have seen her, as you say, tell me whether you have also seen the Aphrodite in the Gardens, at Athens, by Alcamenes?]

Praxiteles and Alcamenes are both cited by Chrysoloras through the words of Maximian and Lucian refers to other artists as well such as Apelles, Zeuxis, Parrhesius and Phidias who appear in the encomium. Indeed, the influence of Lucian would explain why Maximian highlights the pagan goddesses with greater enthusiasm than the male gods. It is precisely those mentioned in Lucian's description of physical beauty of Panthea, notably Athena of Lemnos, Hera, Sosandra Aphrodite and Aphrodite of Cnidus, who also appear in the work of Chrysoloras.

Yet the Byzantine author is not slavishly reproducing Lucian here. At times, he exercises his own knowledge of ancient sculptors and his personal taste when he chooses to give a different example of an artist's work to that picked by Lucian. Lucian in the text above refers to Alcamenes of Lemnos's Aphrodite of the Gardens. Chrysoloras on the other hand cites another of Alcamenes's statues, the Athena which was wrought for the Temple of Hephaestus in Athens.[165] Clearly Chrysoloras was not dependent on Lucian alone for his knowledge of ancient statues. He might have read Niketas Choniates's description of the statues in Constantinople before 1204

and his relative, Manuel Chrysoloras, had described those which were still to be seen there in the early fifteenth century.[166] Relatively few Byzantines, however, took much interest in such things so that, as with the example of Harmenopoulos above, the discussion of art in Maximian's speech would not have been done for the sake of the audience but probably for Chrysoloras's own satisfaction.

Another example of Lucian's influence and of Chrysoloras's manipulation of it, comes from the second part of the *Imagines*. It is mainly the first part of the dialogue that acts as a template for Chrysoloras, though the second does play a minor role. A key moment from it is evoked, where Lucian describes the emptiness of good looks without a worthy soul. Lucian shows how some people worship the exterior of a woman who may have an inferior personality, and to make his thought clearer he likens her to a beautiful temple that is dedicated to an animal, in the manner of the ancient Egyptians. In the words given to Polystratus: 'ἔνδον δὲ ἢν ζητῇς τὸν θεὸν, ἢ πίθηκός ἐστιν ἢ ἶβις ἢ τράγος ἢ αἴλουρος' [but if you seek out the god within, it is either a monkey or an ibis or a goat or a cat!].[167] Chrysoloras takes the aspect of the worship of animals to give St Demetrius the opportunity to convey the Christian message and declare in front of Maximian that people worship different animals in the place of the true God: '῎Ετι οὐ παρέσυραν ἄλογα ζῶα εἰς θεῶν τιμὰς οἱ πολλοί;'[168] [Have the majority not dragged irrational animals to the honours of gods?]. An even longer list of animals than that of Lucian's is given in this case, with ibises and goats, as above, included. Innovation in the treatment of the Lucianic dialogue should be viewed not only in terms of intellectual content and the ideas expressed in the respective works but also in terms of their emotional and dramatic tension.

This chapter set out to explore how classical models were used by some of the encomiasts in their efforts to praise their saint and how they were used not slavishly but selectively. It is easy for the intellectual community to accept collectively (especially if it seems to be the received wisdom) that a highly stylized piece of writing has sacrificed all freedom to the typified perfection of what it imitates. At the same time the opposite is also true: that freedom in stylistic terms

can be the departure from something, and the framework of strict discipline may provide a robust and helpful structure to be free from. Anyone who has worked from a template will have experienced that, as they would have experienced the release that comes with conquering the material and making it their own. In Byzantine literature it is common to have formal praise of emperors, of saints, and of cities. Exclamations to emperors for example (such as upon them entering the liturgy) were lavish in their praise whether the emperors were deserving of it or not.

Fresh interpretations are now being brought to bear on the work of other late Byzantine writers. A bold example of this is John Davis's reinterpretation of *A Depiction of Spring in a Dyed, Woven Hanging* by Demetrius Chrysoloras's contemporary and close friend, the Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos. This text is about a work of tapestry that Manuel saw during his visit to Paris between 1400–2, while trying to raise funds for the empire. In analysing Manuel's *ekphrasis*, Davis points to the 'liquid and labial consonants' in the text and its 'heightened phonetic sensuousness', absent in both the rhetorician Libanius and the Church Father Gregory of Nazianzus who have given us earlier similar treatments. The critical attention that this comparatively lesser work of Manuel has demanded testifies to its originality, and is in line with the discussion of the creative use of the classical tradition in Byzantine literature that has concerned us in this chapter.[169] As this chapter has shown, the late Byzantine encomia display a similar vitality in their *mimesis*.

Chapter Two
Convention and Originality: The Athlete of Christ

The previous chapter examined how classical models helped to define the genre in which the encomia were written. It almost goes without saying, however, that as these are works by Christians in praise of a Christian saint, the greatest influence of all was the Bible and the Church Fathers. Scholars like Demetrius Chrysoloras or Demetrius Kydones who read classical authors like Lucian or Plato formed a tiny minority even within the literate Byzantine population. For most people, reading was limited to the Bible, commentaries on the Bible and some of the more accessible Church Fathers. For example, Eustathios Voilas who died in 1059, possessed several copies of the Gospels and individual books of the Old Testament. He also had the *Hexameron* and *Antirrhetica* of St Basil of Caesarea but the only classical work which he possessed was Aesop's Fables. A member of the Xiphilinos family who flourished in the late thirteenth century, owned a Homer but also several works of St Basil including his commentary on Isaiah.[1] Any appreciation of the encomia, whether as literature or as expressions of religious devotion, demands an investigation of these non-classical sources of inspiration. This chapter will throw light on the biblical and patristic background of these works in general before concentrating on one particular metaphor, that of the 'athlete of Christ'.

To start with, some obvious examples of use of the scriptures will be given. The most favoured books were the Gospels, the Pauline epistles, the Psalms and the Prophets. A clergyman like Isidore Glavas was bound to quote scripture in his encomia. Amongst his citations are two from St Paul's First Epistle to the Thessalonians, making thus the link between the Thessalonica of Paul and that of Demetrius.[2] Isidore also draws upon the message of Christian love in Luke: 'But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good to them which hate

you', and Matthew: 'For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same?'[3] The passages referring to Luke and Matthew were written in 1393, while Thessalonica was under the first Turkish rule. Isidore is therefore urging his fellow-citizens to suffer the Turkish occupation with dignity and faith.

Similar in his choice of biblical citations is Isidore's successor, Gabriel of Thessalonica. His encomia differ from all the others in that the passages from the Bible are not there to support his main thread of thought but rather it is the citations that give the structure to the speech. On some occasions there are as many as three or four quotations per page in the published version of his encomia and they are often given in an extended form that may take up several lines. On occasions, he uses several citations from different books of the Bible all in close proximity, which gives his encomia a thick texture. They are so imbued in biblical references that they are almost subservient to the citations they bring in. Therefore they form a complex organism that almost defies isolated quotation. Yet to give the reader a flavour of his method, an example is offered here.

In the first section of his third encomium, when he wants to emphasise the importance of love in the Christian life, Gabriel makes as many as nine direct quotations from the New Testament.[4] He first quotes the celebrated passage from the First Epistle to the Corinthians: 'Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal'.[5] Then, rather than quoting the rest of the passage, he paraphrases it: 'καὶ πάντα σχεδὸν τὰ πνευματικὰ χαρίσματα καὶ τὴν ἀδίστακτον πίστιν ἣ μεθίστησιν ὄρη καὶ τὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀποβολὴν καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας τοὺς διὰ μαρτυρίου καὶ αἵματος, μηδὲν ὅλως ὠφελοῦντα ταύτης ἄνευ ἀποφαινόμενος'[6] [and he shows forth that almost all the spiritual gifts and the unrelenting faith which moves mountains and the riddance of possessions and the contests through martyrdom and blood, without love are of no benefit at all]. Gabriel re-enforces this by drawing attention to the First Epistle of St John and to the fact that John was very close to Christ: 'τὶ δεῖ τὰ πολλὰ λέγειν; «ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν», Ἰωάννης φησὶ ὁ ἐπιστήθιος καὶ φίλος Χριστοῦ, «καὶ ὁ μένων ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐν

τῳ θεῷ, μένει καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ»'[7] [what is the use of saying too much? "God is love", says John, the bosom friend and beloved of Christ, "and he that dwelleth in the love dwelleth in God and God in him"]. To elaborate his message further, Gabriel reminds his audience of the new commandment given by Christ to the disciples, to love one another, found in the Gospel of John and of the story of the lawyer who asked Jesus what is the great commandment in the law, found in the Gospel of Matthew.[8] Gabriel continues the section in the same way, with five more quotations from the Gospel of John.[9]

The very expressive author Symeon of Thessalonica stamps his own personality on his use of the Bible and he does so differently in his two encomia. His first uses those passages in a poetic way by means of adding depth and beauty to the glorification of the martyr. The second uses them to relate to contemporary events and to provide inspiration and spiritual guidance to his audience.

In his first encomium, Symeon uses a metaphor from Isaiah and the Psalmist David: 'the whole earth is full of his glory' and 'the earth is full of the goodness of the Lord'.[10] He links this imagery of fullness to St Demetrius by showing how the world is replete with his myrrh and his love for his people. Further, Symeon brings in St Paul, who in Romans says of Christ that 'death hath no more dominion over him'.[11] Symeon relates the same to St Demetrius by saying that his myrrh is proof that he is alive: 'ὅτι ζῇ'.[12] Symeon praises St Demetrius for his martyrdom and for despising the rewards of this life. He points out that also St Paul, in Philippians, and David, in Psalm 144, dismiss those rewards, as 'dung' and 'shadow' respectively.[13] The Psalmist makes this point very poetically: 'man is like to vanity: his days are as a shadow that passeth away'. Indeed, St Demetrius is shown to: 'καταπτύει μὲν πάντα τῆς γῆς ὡς ὄναρ, ὑπερορᾷ δὲ πάντων τῶν τῆς κενῆς ταύτης δόξης' [and he detests all the things of the earth as illusions, and he ignores the empty glory of all those things]. He thus becomes one with Christ: 'καὶ ἑνὸς μόνου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅλος γίνεται· καὶ ἐπιθυμεῖ τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐπιτυγχάνει τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ σύμμορφος τῷ πόθῳ καὶ ἔργοις καθίσταται, διὸ καὶ τῆς δόξης καὶ λαμπρότητος Χριστοῦ μέτοχος ἀναδείκνυται'[14]

[and whole-heartedly becomes one with Christ; and he desires the things of Christ, and he succeeds in the things of Christ, and he conforms to His Passions both in his desire and in his deeds, through which he is shown to be a partaker in the glory and brightness of Christ].

In his second encomium, in order to establish the deep need for loving St Demetrius, especially taking into account the feelings of uncertainty in the city, Symeon draws attention to the First Epistle of John, where St John explains that we love Christ because He first loved us. By extension Symeon is saying that his flock must love St Demetrius as he loved both the Lord and them, his people, for both of whom he was martyred.[15] In discussing the first Turkish occupation of Thessalonica in 1387–1403, he cites St Paul: 'καὶ «τίς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστῷ πρὸς Βελίαρ;» Παῦλός φησιν.'[16] [and "What concord hath Christ with Belial", says Paul] to emphasise the incompatibility of Christians and 'infidels'. He also makes a direct reference to the Song of Moses from Exodus, by bringing out Moses and Miriam as an example for the citizens in the whole-hearted manner in which they praise God for their victories.[17] The Song of Moses was one of the Canticles extensively used in hymnography. Symeon makes such references to Exodus repeatedly, for the metaphor of Thessalonica as another Jerusalem was dominant in his mind: 'ἐπήκουσεν αὐτὸς τοῦ κεκακωμένου λαοῦ αὐτοῦ καθὰ δὴ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐκείνου τοῦ πάλαι'[18] [(so) He heard the prayers of his ill-treated people exactly as those of that Israel of old]. Later, discussing the famine conditions that occurred in the city in 1427 due to the Turkish blockade, he refers to a Psalm: 'καὶ ἐν ἑσπέρᾳ μὲν ἦμεν ἐν κλαυθμῷ, ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει δὲ τῷ πρωΐ, καθὰ γέγραπται'[19] [and in the evening we were in tears but in the morning we were rejoicing, as it is written]. The reason for the rejoicing is the intervention of St Demetrius, who provides the citizens with food. For this deed, Symeon compares the saint to Joseph, who provided his brothers with corn when they came to him in Egypt: 'Δημήτριος, ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἰωσὴφ ἐκεῖνον σιτοδότης'[20] [Demetrius, a provider of wheat above that Joseph].

Palamas makes extensive use of biblical references as well. A source that stands out in his encomium for its rarity is the Acts of the Apostles, which does not feature prominently in most other encomiasts. For example, Demetrius is said to have been chosen by God as St Paul was on the road to Damascus.[21] Palamas liked to expand on each allusion and to bring out every aspect of comparison that it offered. Here is a passage in which he describes the young Demetrius with beautiful passages from the Psalms:

> καί, ἵν᾽ εἴπω τὰ τῆς Γραφῆς, καὶ φοῖνιξ ὡς ἐκεῖνος ἀνθῶν ἅτε δίκαιος, καὶ «ἐλαία κατάκαρπος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ», καὶ δένδρον παρὰ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὑδάτων πεφυτευμένον τοῦ Πνεύματος· πλὴν ὅτι τὸ μέν, κατὰ τὸ ψαλμικόν, «δίδωσι τὸν καρπὸν ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ», ὁ δὲ πάντα καιρὸν ἀνθηφορίας ὁμοῦ καὶ καρποφορίας καὶ εἶχε καὶ ἔχει· καὶ ὥσπερ τὸ ἐκείνου τοῦ δένδρου φύλλον οὐκ ἀπορρυήσεταί ποτε κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, οὕτω τούτου μετὰ τῶν φύλλων καὶ τὸ ἄνθος καὶ ὁ καρπός, ἀνεκλείπτως τοῖς πιστῶς προσπιοῦσι μεταδιδόμενα.[22] [and in order to speak of the Scripture, he is a phoenix that flourishes exactly like that just man, and 'an olive tree full of fruit in the house of God', and a tree planted near the outlets of the waters of the Holy Spirit; except that the one in the Psalm 'gives fruit in its season', but he always had and has the season of bearing flowers and fruit; and exactly as the leaves of that tree, as it is written, will not ever wither, in the same way with them the flowers and the fruit (will remain) and will be communed without fail to those who draw near faithfully].

He then extends the metaphor of the tree by presenting as a type for St Demetrius the rod of Aaron, and Aaron himself as a type for Christ:

> μᾶλλον δὲ Χριστοῦ τοῦ αἰωνίου ἀρχιερέως ῥάβδος καὶ σκῆπτρον θεῖον, εἰ δὲ βούλει, καὶ ὄρπηξ ἀειθαλὴς καὶ θεοειδὴς ὁ Δημήτριος, οὗ Χριστοῦ τύπος ᾿Ααρὼν ἦν. Καὶ ὁ μὲν Χριστοῦ τύπος, Δημητρίου δὲ τοῦ τὰ πάντα καλοῦ σκήπτρου Χριστοῦ τελοῦντος ῥάβδος ἐκείνη τύπος, ὁμοῦ τε βλαστήσασα καὶ ἀνθήσασα καὶ τοὺς καρποὺς προβαλομένη τε ἅμα καὶ τελεσφορήσασα θείως.[23] [and even more, Demetrius (is) the rod and divine sceptre of Christ, the eternal high priest, if we want to put it that way, and an evergreen twig and godly in sight; and the type of Christ is Aaron. He [Aaron] is the type of Christ, and that rod of Demetrius the type of the good sceptre of Christ who fulfills everything, which both flowers and bears fruit, and at once brings forth fruit and divinely ripens].

Laymen, too, used the Bible in their encomia. In giving his own healing as a reason for writing his encomium to St Demetrius, Metochites recalls the pain caused by his ailment by referring to the Prophet Jeremiah: '*καὶ ἡ πληγή μου*, τὸ τῆς γραφῆς, *ἀλγεινή*'[24] [and my wound, as in the scripture, is grievous]. To underline that the martyr had his sights on the rewards of the soul and not on the rewards of this world, Metochites brings in a quotation from Psalm 30: '*τίς ὠφέλειᾳ τῷ αἵματί μου ἐν τῷ καταβαίνειν με εἰς διαφθοράν*, ὃ φησὶν ἡ γραφή'[25] [what is the profit in my blood when I descend to corruption, as the scripture says?]. It is typical of a scholar like him, though, to follow this up closely with a line from Plato's *Euthydemus*. In the same way, after he likens the gladiator Lyaeus with Diomedes, he couples this with a passage from Luke, to show the resolve of Nestor to fight and that once he made up his mind to put himself in the contest for Christ, there was no way back: 'καὶ οὐκ ἐπείθετο *ἐπ᾽ ἄροτρον βαλὼν τὴν χεῖρα ἔπειτα στρέφειν ὄπισθεν*'[26] [and he would not be persuaded once he had put his hand on the plough to then turn backwards].

Nikephoros Gregoras is another layman who has passages from the scriptures in his encomium. The most striking is one linking the myrrh of St Demetrius with the nard (in the Greek called myrrh) which the penitent woman poured on the head of Christ in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, and which Mary the sister of Martha used to anoint His feet, according to John. The myrrh of St Demetrius is said to purify the soul like nard purifies the body.[27] Constantine Harmenopoulos ties his biblical allusions to the physical surroundings of the church of the Acheiropoietos. He chooses an architectural passage from Proverbs, for instance, to show the magnificence of the church: 'Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars'. Harmenopoulos describes the Acheiropoietos as being built with seven pillars in the same manner, by the wisdom of God.[28] Together with the description of the Acheiropoietos, prominent in Harmenopoulos is the veneration of the Virgin Mary. A reference to the Gospel of John reflects this, when Harmenopoulos marvels at the mystery of the Word made flesh: 'ὃν γὰρ ἐνυπόστατον τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτῆς ἐγκάτοις ἀρρήτως αὕτη συνείληφε, σάρκα δι᾽ ἡμᾶς τὸν λόγον τοῦτον γενόμενον'[29] [which true

Word of God she conceived in a mysterious way in her womb, this Word for our sake become flesh].

There were, however, some encomiasts who seem not to have used biblical references. Demetrius Chrysoloras did not quote scripture at all. Nicholas Kavasilas, who adorns his first two encomia with biblical references, makes no use of them whatever in his third encomium which is entirely Homeric in flavour. More intriguing is the fact that even monks like George Scholarios and Makarios Choumnos made very sparse use of the scriptures. To sum up the question of the use of biblical allusions in the encomia, therefore, it can be said that there was no hard and fast rule. Each author had his own particular approach.

Direct references to the Church Fathers are much rarer in the encomia. Gabriel of Thessalonica, for example refers in passing to St Basil and St John Chrysostom but these authors do not underpin his work in the way that the biblical books do.[30] In this respect one encomium really stands out, that of Philotheos Kokkinos, which encompasses with ease not only many Biblical passages but also a wide range of Patristic literature. Gregory of Nazianzus, Clement of Alexandria, Basil, John Damascene, Pseudo-Dionysus the Areopagite, Gregory of Neocaesarea, Cyril of Alexandria, Athanasius the Great and John Chrysostom all play a significant role in his encomium, showing how much his thought processes differ to those of the other authors who wrote encomia.[31]

The use of biblical and patristic examples in the encomia has been briefly outlined. Yet their use is so embedded in these works that to enumerate them all would be tedious. Instead, this chapter will now concentrate on just one metaphor, that of the 'athlete of Christ' and will show how its use in the encomia reflects its development in the New Testament and the Greek Fathers.

The notion of a Christian martyr as an athlete of Christ was not new in the fourteenth century. It follows a long theological tradition and has its roots in Hebrew texts. As far as the Byzantine authors are concerned though, their sources for the metaphor were St Paul's epistles and their reception by St John Chrysostom who was Paul's major interpreter. St Gregory of Nyssa, St John Klimakos, and St Ephraem the Syrian, all contributed to the same notion of the

fighting Christian striving for perfection and martyrdom. In origin, the idea owes something also to pre-Christian, Greco-Roman values that were expressed in athletic competitions such as the Olympic and Panhellenic games where the contestant took part solely for the glory of winning. St Paul introduced contest as a metaphor for the Christian life in his letters, perhaps influenced by witnessing the Isthmian Games during his visit to Corinth, which of course were hosted there. The Isthmian Games, held every two years in honour of Poseidon, were one of the four Panhellenic Games of antiquity. Before competing, the athletes took an oath to the sea-god Palaemon, protector of sailors, not to try to obtain the prize of victory by cheating.[32] The same message appears in Paul's second letter to Timothy: 'And if a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully'.[33]

The athletic imagery resonates richly in many of the writings of the Pauline tradition. For example, the Letter to the Hebrews, which is attributed to him, says: 'let us run with patience the race that is set before us'.[34] As well as the idea of a race, he brings in that of a prize at the end of it: 'I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Jesus Christ' and 'Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain.'[35] In this way, Paul introduced into Christianity elements of competition alongside its doctrines of tolerance and sacrifice which ultimately made possible the idea of Christians fighting for a just cause.[36]

The notion of contest that had been introduced by St Paul was picked up and extended by the Greek Fathers of the Church. It is, however, St John Chrysostom among them who does most to extend Paul's idea of contest. Chrysostom was particularly devoted to the Apostle and wrote a commentary on all the Pauline Epistles. In his *Homily on the Second Letter to the Corinthians*, Chrysostom expresses how he feels about its author: '῎Απαντας μὲν φιλῶ τοὺς ἁγίους, μάλιστα δὲ τὸν μακάριον Παῦλον' [I love all the saints, but most of all the blessed Paul]. Or: 'Ἐκκαίομαι γὰρ εἰς τὸν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς πόθον' [For I am burning in the love for the man]. Consequently, Chrysostom became the main ambassador of Pauline thought to future generations.[37]

It is only to be expected then that Chrysostom would reflect St Paul's ideas and metaphors in his own work, including the idea of contest and prize. Paul's soul, for example, is described by Chrysostom as one that is the most prepared for combat: 'οὐδὲν τῆς Παύλου ψυχῆς ἀγωνιστικώτερον' and 'a soul arrayed against death', 'ψυχῆς πρὸς θάνατον παρατεταγμένης', which (i.e. death) is the ultimate prize.[38] Chrysostom, however, takes it further by using the word 'athlete' to describe someone pursuing the Christian life and applying it to St Paul himself. He calls him an 'Ἀθλητὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ' [athlete of Christ] and 'καὶ καθάπερ τις ἀθλητὴς' [exactly like someone who is an athlete].[39] Chrysostom did not, however, restrict the metaphor to St Paul. He applies it to all Christians as here he talks about those who feel like quitting before the contest is over: 'Καθάπερ γὰρ ὁ πυκτεύων ἐπείγεται τοῦ σταδίου ἐξελθεῖν, ἵνα ἀπαλλαγῇ τῶν τραυμάτων· καὶ ὁ ἀθλητὴς ἀναστῆναι τὸ θέατρον ἐπιθυμεῖ, ἵνα ἐλευθερωθῇ τῶν πόνων (…)'[40] [Exactly as the boxer feels the urgency to exit the stadium, so that he can get rid of his wounds and the athlete desires to rise from the theatre, so that he can become free of his pains (…)].

With the ideas of contest, race, prize and athlete established, Christian writers could extend the metaphors in all kinds of ways. John Chrysostom, for instance, builds on the idea of the Christian as an athlete by linking it to a portrait of dignified manhood that has, at first sight, little to do with specifically Christian morality:

> Ποία γὰρ κοινωνία μέθῃ καὶ μάχῃ; γαστρίζεσθαι καὶ ἀνδρίζεσθαι; μύροις καὶ ὅπλοις; πολέμῳ καὶ κώμοις; Στρατιώτης εἶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀγαπητὲ, ὁπλίζου, μὴ καλλωπίζου· ἀθλητὴς εἶ γενναῖος, ἀνδρίζου, μὴ ὡραΐζου.[41] [What is the connection between drunkenness and battle? Between indulging in food and being manly? Between war and hairstyles? You are a soldier of Christ, beloved one, arm yourself, do not beautify yourself. You are a brave athlete, be manly, don't be made pretty].

The lead taken by John Chrysostom was followed by later writers. St John Klimakos (of the Ladder, c. 570–649) in his work *The Ladder of Divine Ascent* presents the spiritual path as a competition:

> Οἱ προθύμως καὶ ὀξέως δραμεῖν βουλόμενοι, νουνεχῶς ἐπισκεψώμεθα πῶς ὁ Κύριος πάντας τοὺς ἐν κόσμῳ διατρίβοντας καὶ ζῶντας νεκροὺς κατεδίκασεν, εἰπὼν πρός τινα· ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς κοσμικούς, τοὺς τῷ σώματι νεκροὺς θάψαι[42] [If we really wish to enter the contest of religious life, we should take careful heed to the sense in which the Lord described those remaining in the world as living corpses. What he said was, in effect, 'Let the living dead who are in the world bury those dead in the body']. [43]

He then extends the metaphor of contest to show the rewards and also the challenges of the Christian life:

> Γινωσκέτωσαν πάντες οἱ τῷ καλῷ ἀγῶνι τούτῳ τῷ σκληρῷ καὶ στενῷ καὶ ελαφρῷ προσερχόμενοι, ὡς εἰς πῦρ προσεληλύθασιν εἰσπηδῆσαι, εἴπερ πῦρ ἄϋλον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς οἰκῆσαι ἐκδέχονται· δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἕκαστος ἑαυτὸν, καὶ οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου αὐτῆς τοῦ μετὰ πικρίδων, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου αὐτῆς τοῦ μετὰ δακρύων ἐσθιέτω καὶ πινέτω, ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρῖμα ἑαυτῷ στρατεύηται[44] [Let all those coming up to this marvellous, tough, and painful – though also easy – contest leap, as it were, into a fire, so that a non-material flame may take up residence within them. But let each one test himself, draw food and drink from the bread of pain and the cup of weeping, lest he march himself to judgement]. [45]

It may sound a paradox to call something that is difficult and heavy 'light', but it is thought to be made light, for those who are deemed worthy, by the mercy of God. As the gospel says: 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.'[46] Similarly, the ninth-century abbot of Stoudios, Theodore of Stoudios, praised his uncle Plato as an athlete and a confessor of Christ:

> καὶ τέμνεται μὲν τὴν κεφαλὴν οὐδαμῶς, ὅτι μηδὲ ἠβούλετο ὁ Καῖσαρ μάρτυρα τελέσαι τὸν τῇ προαιρέσει ἀθλήσαντα, ὡς προλαβὼν ἀπεφθέγξατο, ὁμολογητὴν Χριστοῦ καὶ μὴ βουλόμενος ἀπέδειξεν (…)[47] [and he does not cut off his head, as he does not want, the Caesar, to make a martyr of the voluntary athlete, as of the one who came first, when he spoke up, but he proves him a confessor of Christ though not wanting to (…)].

A similar approach is taken by the twelfth-century Cypriot monk, Neophytos the Recluse, in his encomium to St Demetrius. He describes how an angel comes down from heaven while Demetrius is

in prison awaiting his martyrdom and says to him the following to strengthen him during his ordeal: 'εἰρήνη σοι, τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀθλητά, ἴσχυε καὶ ἀνδρίζου'[48] [Peace be with you, athlete of Christ, have strength and be manly]. One could produce many more such examples both in Byzantine and Latin literature. As regards the latter, the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* describes the crusader leader, Bohemond of Taranto (c.1058–1111) as an athlete of Christ: 'Christi Athleta'.[49] The athlete had become a commonplace of Christian panegyric.

It is clear, then, that the athlete metaphor had a long and distinguished pedigree. It is therefore not surprising that it occurs again and again in the late Byzantine encomia to St Demetrius. Indeed, it was only natural for the metaphor to be attributed to him, given his youth at the time of his death, his background as a military saint and as a soldier in the Roman army and the elements of both physical and spiritual struggle that were present in his martyrdom. Thus while urging Christians to excel in their faith, the metropolitan Gabriel also reminds them in his encomium to compete fairly: «νομίμως ἀθλῆσαι», κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Παύλου φωνήν', an echo of the voice of St Paul.[50] Gabriel presents God as the just judge of the contest:

> 'Τίς οὕτως ἄκριτος ἀθλοθέτης, ὡς τῶν ἴσων ἀξιῶσαι στεφάνων τὸν νικητὴν καὶ τὸν μηδὲν ἠγωνισμένον; τίς στρατηγὸς εἰς τὴν μερίδαν τῶν σκύλων ἐξ ἴσου ποτὲ τοῖς νενικηκόσι τοὺς μηδὲ φανέντας ἐπὶ τῆς μάχης ἐκάλεσεν; Ἀγαθὸς ὁ θεὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ δίκαιος·[51] [What ill-judged umpire would award the same garlands to the champion and to he who did not take part in the contest? What general has ever called equally to the spoils of war the victors and those who did not show up for battle? The Lord is good but he is also righteous].

Makarios Choumnos, on the other hand, addresses St Demetrius as 'the greatest athlete of Christ' in the hope that he will strengthen him in the specific task of being abbot and dealing with the brothers in his monastery.[52] Nicholas Kavasilas tells the saint: 'καὶ τῶν θείων πραγμάτων ἀθλητὴς ὑπὲρ πάντας ἀνεφάνης τοὺς ἄλλους'[53] [and in the divine things you proved yourself an athlete above all others]. Incidentally, this figure of speech when the author addresses

the hero in the second person is called *apostrophê*, it is an indication of intimacy and affection and it stems from Homer. In the *Iliad*, typically the poet's most favoured characters like Patroclus or Menelaus are addressed in this way. Constantine Harmenopoulos calls Demetrius: 'ὁ τῶν ἀθλητῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ μέγιστος' [the greatest of the athletes of Christ], and 'ἀληθὴς καὶ χριστομίμητος ὄντως ἀθλητὴς' [a true athlete who certainly imitated Christ].[54] George Scholarios praises the saint for his 'athletic patience' (τῆς ἀθλητικῆς καρτερίας τοῦ μάρτυρος).[55] Scholarios also refers to the spear which pierced the side of Demetrius, which was 'τῷ ἀθλητικῷ πεφοινιγμένη αἵματι'[56] [reddened by the athletic blood]. We also find the extension of the idea into struggle and fighting. Thus Theodore Metochites describes how the victory of Nestor against the champion gladiator Lyaeus was achieved through the efforts of the one who had been a 'πάντ᾽ ἄριστος ὁπλίτης Χριστοῦ'[57] [always an excellent armed fighter of Christ], that is to say, Demetrius himself.

It could be said that in using this metaphor, these authors were simply blindly following a trend. After all, in late Byzantine literature the quality of the athlete as a great Christian was being applied even to the most unathletic of people, such elderly clergymen and bishops. In his encomium to St Gregory Palamas, his pupil Philotheos Kokkinos, who was responsible for his canonisation, praises him as an athlete despite the fact he did not have to shed his blood for his faith:

> θεολόγων καὶ πατέρων καὶ διδασκάλων καλλώπισμα, τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ συναγωνιστής, ὁ τῶν ὁμολογητῶν καὶ μαρτύρων ἀναίμακτος ζηλωτὴς καὶ στεφανίτης καὶ λόγοις καὶ πράγμασι, καὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀθλητὴς καὶ στρατηγὸς καὶ ὑπέρμαχος[58] [an embellishment of theologians, fathers, and teachers, the fellow-combatant of the apostles, the bloodless zealot and wreath-wearer of the confessors of the faith and the martyrs through his words and actions, and the athlete of piety and a general and a fighter].

The patriarch of Constantinople and fervent Palamite, Isidore I Boucheiras (1347–50) is described in similar terms by Kokkinos: 'ἀναίμακτος μάρτυς καὶ στεφανίτης λαμπρὸς καὶ ἀήττητος' [a bloodless martyr and a wreath-wearer who is brilliant (with light) and unbeaten]. The hesychast saint Romylos was labelled a 'spiritual

athlete' by his hagiographer.[59] The metaphor of combat is further extended by Kokkinos when he refers to Palamas as 'our wrestler': 'ὁ ἐμὸς παλαιστὴς'.[60] Even the citizens of Thessalonica were awarded this accolade. Nikephoros Gregoras claimed that they had partaken in the struggles of St Demetrius and therefore shared in his victory: 'τοῖς ἀγῶσι τοῦ μάρτυρος συναθλεῖν' [and they (i.e. the citizens) are fellow-athletes of the martyr in his trials].[61] In Harmenopoulos's encomium, Demetrius rewards the citizens ('βραβεύων'), by his attention to their prayers. In the city they perform such rites 'οἷς ὁ τῶν ἀθλητῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ κόσμος παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγάλλεται'[62] [by which (i.e. by the material expressions of the rituals) the world of the athletes of Christ is gratified amongst men].

A touching twist to the theme of an athlete is the letter of Symeon of Thessalonica to Manuel's third son, the Despot of Thessalonica Andronikos. In the letter Symeon attributes the strengths of a spiritual athlete to the young despot when he was at his weakest, at the point of leaving office and handing over the city to the Venetians. Of interest here is how Symeon pays tribute to him for his choice of monasticism. He not only points out the demands of the spiritual path by bringing in the athletic metaphor, he also links the upcoming spiritual achievements of the despot with those of Christ. Symeon projects a vision of the despot in his future monastic career where he is following the contest of Christ, τὸν ἄθλον, showing him to be in that way Christ's imitator: 'Σὺ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μιμητὴς τοῦ διὰ σὲ ταπεινοῦ. (…) Οὐκέτι γήϊνος εἶ, ἀλλὰ πολίτης τῶν ἄνω, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ τῶν ἄνω δεσπότου συμβασιλεύς τε καὶ σύναθλος'[63] [For you are not earthly, but a citizen of above, and rather a joint king and fellow athlete of the master of heaven].

Common though the athlete metaphor was, however, the use made of it in the encomia to St Demetrius went much further than merely repeating a hackneyed formula. The fact was that the formula had always been modified according to the needs of each period and society. In the later Byzantine period a number of influences caused the metaphor to be used in different ways that are reflected in the encomia. Two of these will now be considered: the development of Hesychast spirituality and the revived study of the Classics.

Hesychasm is one of the most obvious influences that changed the way in which the metaphor was used. Hesychast leaders such Gregory Palamas and Philotheos Kokkinos seem to have seen the athlete metaphor in terms of the athlete of the spirit fighting a mystical battle. Gregory Palamas credits St Demetrius with completing the race of martyrdom, 'τὸν γὰρ δρόμον τελέσας' [having finished the race], in very standard terms. He goes further, however, and dwells on the idea of struggle with Demetrius 'ἐνστὰς μέχρι αἵματος' [having resisted to the (end of his) blood]. Palamas makes clear what Demetrius is struggling against: 'καὶ μέχρις αἵματος εἰς τέλος ἀντικατέστη πρὸς τὴν κακίαν ἀγωνιζόμενος' [and he resisted to the blood and death, battling against evil]. He was 'τῇ ἀντιθέτῳ προσπαλαίων κακίᾳ' [fighting with his foe, depravity]. Unlike Nestor, who fought a physical enemy, Demetrius fights a spiritual one, evil itself, a subtle difference which Palamas can hardly have been unaware.[64]

Similarly, in Philotheos Kokkinos's encomium, St Demetrius is said to have 'ὀξέως ἔδραμε δρόμον'[65] [run the race sharply]. Indeed, Kokkinos seems to have been directly influenced here by St Paul's notion of contest. As he puts it in another passage: 'εἰσιόντα προθύμως τὸν ἄθλον' [having taken up the contest willingly], 'μηδὲ τὸ ἐαυτοῦ ζητεῖν, «ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν, ὅπως σωθῶσι» κατὰ τὸν θαυμαστὸν Παῦλον' [and not seeking for himself, "but for the many, so that they may be saved" according to the admirable Paul], he died for the love of Christ.[66] Like Palamas, Kokkinos lays emphasis on the spiritual struggle. He addresses Demetrius as 'ἀγωνιστῶν Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀθλητῶν ἄριστε'[67] [of the combatants and athletes of Christ the most excellent]. He shows Nestor to have credited Demetrius for inspiring him in his physical victory against Lyaeus: 'τῆς ὑπερφυοῦς καὶ θαυμαστῆς νίκης ἐκείνης ἀρχηγὸν σε καὶ δημιουργὸν, ὅπερ ἦν, λογισάμενος'[68] [(Nestor) thinking of you exactly as the leader and creator of that supernatural and admirable victory]. Nestor, Demetrius's companion in the martyrdom, embodies the more physical part of the battle, by being the one who fights with and humiliates the champion gladiator strengthened by St Demetrius's prayers. The alleged scorpion that St Demetrius is said to have dispatched in his cell, can be interpreted as a

manifestation of an inner struggle, similar to the one faced by monks in their personal journeys.

The notion of an athletic Demetrius involved in a spiritual struggle was not confined to militant hesychasts. Constantine Harmenopoulos, who wrote an attack on Palamas's teaching, uses mystical terminology in his encomium when he says, after St John of Klimakos: 'ἀναβασμοῖς … πνευματικοῖς, ἐξ ἀρετῆς εἰς ἀρετὴν … μέχρις ἂν εἰς αὐτὸ φθάσειε τῆς ἀληθοῦς θεογνωσίας τὸ μέγιστον διῆρες'[69] [spiritual … levels, from virtue to virtue … until he (St Demetrius) reached the finest vessel itself of the true knowledge of God]. Here is the idea of an athletic spiritual contest as the saint climbs the ladder of the spiritual life.

The revived study of the Classics during the Palaiologan renaissance may well have changed the way in which the athlete metaphor was used in the encomia. Developed by St Paul and the Church Fathers from a Greco-Roman ethos of physical contest, it was now reconnected by late Byzantine authors to its distant roots. Nikephoros Gregoras uses the metaphor of δρόμος, in the sense of a running track, a fairly standard use of the athletic lexical set. However, he takes it further than other authors by using it to make a comparison between St Demetrius and Alexander the Great: 'τοῖς γὰρ ἀνομοίοις ἀγῶσι καὶ δρόμοις ἀνὸμοιον καὶ τὸ πέρας ἀνάγκη συνεῖναι'[70] [the different contests and running races have by necessity a different end result]. Gregoras's argument is that Alexander had goals that were of this world, while St Demetrius had goals that were of the other world. In that fact St Demetrius has proved himself to be superior. Notions of contest and of struggle towards one's goals are dominant in Gregoras's encomium, and the classical ideal is incorporated with ease in his praise of the saint. He expands on this idea with the image of St Demetrius struggling towards distinct goals in his cell: 'Δημήτριος, εἷς ὢν καὶ δεσμώτης, διπλοῦν ἐποιεῖτο τὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς παρατάξεως ἐν στενωτάτῳ χωρίῳ δεσμωτηρίου'[71] [Demetrius, although alone and a prisoner, was making twice the contest of an army-in-array in the extremely narrow confines of his prison cell]. After the martyr's

death, the same image seems to resonate in the entire world, through the veneration, and in the minds of the faithful:

> Καὶ νῦν ἐστιν ὁρᾶν τὴν κεκρυμμένην ἐκείνην παράταξιν τοῦ μαρτυρικοῦ πολέμου τὰ πέρατα περιηχοῦσαν τῆς γῆς, καὶ νικῶντα μὲν τὸν ἀθλητὴν πανταχῇ, ἡττώμενον δὲ Μαξιμιανὸν καὶ Λυαῖον καὶ ὅπλων ἐκείνων καὶ παλαισμάτων τὸ κράτος αἰσχυνόμενον δι᾽ αἰῶνος· οὕτω παντὸς ᾽Αλεξάνδρου περιφανέστερος ὁ τοῦ μάρτυρος γέγονε θάνατος·[72] [And now one can see that hidden army-in-array of the war of martyrdom resounding to the ends of the earth, and the athlete winning everywhere, and Maximian and Lyaeus losing, and the might of their arms and artifice being shamed through the ages; in such a manner the death of the martyr became more prominent than every Alexander].

It is in the success of the goal that the merit of the effort is judged: ‘κεῖθεν τὸ μεῖζον καὶ ἧττον τοῦ τε τόνου καὶ τῆς τέχνης κρίνεται’[73] [and that is where (i.e. in achieving the target) the most and the least of the tension and the skill is judged]. In short, Gregoras has brought the Christian athlete metaphor back to its classical origins.

Similarly, Demetrius Chrysoloras starts his encomium with an address that betrays a sense of awe towards the great athlete:

> Δημήτριος, τὸ γλυκὺ πρᾶγμα, τὸ θαυμαστὸν ὄνομα, τὸ μέγα τῶν ἀθλητῶν ἄκουσμα, τῶν μαρτύρων ἡ δόξα, τῶν ἀγωνιζομένων ἡ κορυφή, τὸ ξένον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς θέαμα, τὸ οὐράνιον ἄγαλμα, ᾧ πολὺς μὲν ἀγὼν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Θεοῦ … Τίς ἔπαινος ἄξιος, ποῖον ἐγκώμιον ἀρκετὸν αὐτῷ, τίς εὐφημία πρέπουσα … τοσοῦτον ἔργον ἡ τοῦ μάρτυρος ἄθλησις·[74] [Demetrius, the sweet thing, the wondrous name, the great instruction of athletes, the glory of martyrs, the pinnacle of the ones who strive, the rare sight on earth, the heavenly image, who strived greatly in favour of God … Which laud (is) worthy, what encomium is enough for him, which acclamation befitting? … so much of an accomplishment is the athletic feat of the martyr].

The heroic spirit of the athlete who is willing to be martyred for Christ is shown further by Chrysoloras to be the result of great self-discipline over the natural impulses of youth, and therefore even more laudable:

> (…) οὐκ εἴα μειρακιώδη τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἀχαλίνωτον εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τῷ μὲν λογιστικῷ τὴν γνῶσιν, αὐτῇ δὲ τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἐφαρμόττει καὶ τῷ μὲν

> θυμῷ τὴν ἀνδρείαν, αὐτῇ δὲ συνέπλεξε τὸ μέχρις αἵματος ἀγωνίζεσθαι.[75] [… he did not leave his youthful desire unbridled but he applied knowledge to rationality and to this the faith, and to temperament his bravery, and this latter quality contributed to his fighting to the last drop of blood].

In referring to Demetrius's youth in this way, Chrysoloras is emphasising his humanity and hinting at his physical desirability. Yet he stops at a hint. It is other authors who take that strand even further. Theodore Metochites refers to the 'ἰσχὺς σώματος' [firmness of the body][76] of the saint. Curiously it is not only classicising laymen that make such references but even clergymen with hesychast sympathies. The Metropolitan of Thessalonica, Symeon, acknowledges the physical attractiveness of St Demetrius by calling him the most beautiful athlete: 'ὁ κάλλιστος ἀθλητής'.[77] Philotheos Kokkinos admired his 'ῥώμη σώματος'[78] [strength of the body]. Thus we have come full circle and are back once more in the classical world where the games celebrated youth, strength and beauty.

To conclude this chapter, the way in which certain abstract values were applied to persons is an important topic when concerned with the construction of sainthood. Saints served as constructed examples that conformed to projected ideals of Christian life, in that they could be helpful to societies as images that provided social cohesion, and to the church as figures to look upon for protection against heresies. The notion of the athlete in Christian thought created prototypes for the faithful to follow. Praise to a Christian congregation implies need of imitation, and the values that are projected are pivotal for the practicing Christian and for the Christian life. Nevertheless, although we can see the encomia as fitting into these wider paradigms, their frequent and intense use of the athlete and wreath metaphors and of the hyperbolic comparisons were undoubtedly the products of the times in which they were written.

Chapter Three
Internal Literary Evidence for the Festival of the Saint

Previous chapters have examined aspects of genre and style. In this chapter and the next, the discussion will turn to content. The late Byzantine encomia to St Demetrius are rich in information about the absorbed and impassioned veneration that he enjoyed. They are also in themselves instruments in that veneration, as they were used during worship, or, in some cases, privately, and inspired feelings of devotion in the listeners. During the festival, or the saint's *panegyris*, they were an important centrepiece and they prompted the public to participate in worship fully.[1] One of the ways in which the encomia inspired devotion was to point at other elements of the festival that did so, as well as referring to the encomium in progress, and to other encomia delivered in the past. They also described the experience of the speaker, and the difficulty involved in the preparation of their piece. Such descriptions, although somewhat formulaic and often repetitive, or not that original in their content, increased in the audience a sense of the active participation of the encomiast in the saint's praise. They also gave a sense of warmth and intimacy to the speech.

Apart from the fact that by their style and feel the encomia give us valuable insights into how St Demetrius was thought of by the Byzantines, there is also specific information recorded in them about the formalities of the cult and the beliefs that were at their root. Things that to us seem contentious doctrinal points, for instance, may appear in the encomia as theological commonplaces. Such instances show us where the lines were drawn. Associations that are made show us the cultural context in which the veneration took place, and the nature of the community likely to have been involved in it.

One of the encomiasts, Constantine Harmenopoulos, claims that the festival to St Demetrius plainly excels over all the secular

festivals that could be compared with it: 'πάσας ἐγκοσμίους ἀτεχνῶς ὑπεραίρει' [it plainly outdoes all of the secular ones]. This is in keeping with the excellence of the martyr, whom Harmenopoulos says to be the bravest amongst the excellent (athletes) of Christ: 'τῶν ἀριστέων τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενναιότατον οἶδα'.[2]

While studying the festival of St Demetrius one is struck by its air of universality as well as its large base of local devotion. The native inhabitants were seemingly joined for the festivities by many other worshippers, certainly Christian, and most probably in their majority Byzantine, if we judge from the inter-textual references made and the cultural values expounded in the encomia. One encomium that throws light on who participated in the festival is that of Nikephoros Gregoras. He says that people came for the festival from all over the world, moved by their longing for their beloved saint. The longing for devotion to the saint is a recurrent theme in the encomia and goes hand in hand with the longing for martyrdom of which the saint is a shining example:

> Τοιγαροῦν καὶ συνερρύηκε· ποθοῦσι μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἅπαντες ὅσοι τὰ καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς πρεσβεύουσι νόμιμα, καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης πανταχῇ τεκμήρια περιφανῆ τοῦ τοιούτου πρόκεινται πόθου[3] [Accordingly they come together like currents; because all those who honour our customs have a longing for him, and there are distinct proofs of that longing everywhere in the world].

The phrase ἅπαντες ὅσοι τὰ καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς πρεσβεύουσι νόμιμα can be an indication as to the cultural boundaries to which the pilgrims to St Demetrius may have conformed. Egypt, Libya, the Arabic lands, Caucasus, and the straits of Gibraltar are some of the places that Gregoras mentions for their firm dedication to the memory of the saint and for following the fasts and preparations for his festival. Of those the latter is clearly a rhetorical commonplace, in keeping with his fondness for mythical citation but the others seem realistic. He also suggests that churches and icons dedicated to him were found in those parts.[4]

The places that Gregoras quotes are all south of Thessalonica or east, which makes one think that he refers to pilgrims who were steeped in the Orthodox tradition, and had an intimate knowledge of

the life of the saint. Many monasteries kept the flame of Orthodoxy alive in those parts after they were lost to the Byzantine Empire. There is no reference to westerners present in the festival for pilgrimage, although the twelfth century *Timarion* does mention that they were present at the commercial fair at least.[5] There may have been occasional pilgrims who combined mercantile activities with worship. The ethos of the cult would not have encouraged haphazard veneration though, as what is applauded throughout the encomia is a passionate and constant dedication to the saint.

There is a sense of great familiarity and intimacy between St Demetrius and his worshippers that is evident in Gregoras's account. He describes how they revel in the saint's spiritual presence during proceedings:

> ἀλλ᾽ εἰς ὅτι πλεῖστον αὐτῷ συνησθῆναι καὶ οἷον εἰπεῖν συνευωχηθῆναι καὶ προσλαλῆσαι καὶ συμποπεῦσαι τῇ δόξῃ ταύτῃ καὶ εὐγενείᾳ καὶ οὑτωσί πως τοῦ φλέγοντος πόθου τὸ πῦρ ἀναπαῦσαι, τελεώτερον ἢ κατὰ πᾶσαν δρῶντες Ἑλλάδα καὶ πάντας Ἕλληνας[6] [but to the greatest extent possible to be united with him and so to speak to feast with him and to converse with him and to accompany this glory (meaning the saint) and nobility, and in this way to bring to some repose the fire of their burning desire (for him), much more perfectly than those acting in the whole of Greece and all the Greeks].

This intimacy between the faithful and the saint also has implications for the achievement of their goal as Christians: 'τοῖς ἀγῶσι τοῦ μάρτυρος συναθλεῖν καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἀγαθὰς ἐλπίδας ἑτοίμους ἑαυτοὺς παρασκευάζειν ἀεί'[7] [to be a fellow-athlete to the contests of the martyr, and towards the good hopes (i.e. of salvation) to be constantly making themselves ready]. The metaphor of the athlete of the Christian life occurs here again. The preparation period before the feast is said to be like a sacrifice: 'τοῦτ᾽ αὐτοῖς τῆς ἑορτῆς ἀρχομένου μηνὸς εὐθὺς οἱονεὶ προτέλεια μέχρι καὶ πρὸς αὐτήν ἐστι τὴν πανήγυριν'[8] [as soon as the month of the festival begins, to them it is like a sacrificial offering, until the day of the celebration]. This preparation period mirrors Advent and Lent, in keeping with the mirroring of the life of St Demetrius to the life of Christ.

Gregoras, who was not from Thessalonica,[9] describes the love of the inhabitants for St Demetrius as a motivation for himself. His description paints a picture of worshippers who had prayer in their hearts constantly, and they were meditating upon the saint's martyrdom round the clock. Such rigorous practices of prayer in Thessalonica sound very likely, considering the strong monastic influence there:

> ἐμὲ δ᾽ ὁ τῶν οἰκητόρων ζῆλος καὶ πόθος ὀτρύνει θαυμάζειν, ὃν ἐν τοῖς τῆς καρδίας νύκτωρ καὶ μεθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἀεὶ περιθάλποντες[10] [but as for me, the passion and longing of the inhabitants urges me to show my admiration for him whom they keep with warmth within their hearts night and day]

Gregoras writes his encomium with great conviction and he likens his offering of a speech to St Demetrius to a garland of flowers: 'ὥσπερ εἴ τις γεωργὸς νεοφανέσι καρποῖς περιηνθησμένον κομίζει στέφανον'[11] [exactly as a labourer of the land brings a garland adorned with fresh fruit]. This is another way of linking the festival to springtime, by associating the blossoming of flowers with feelings of joy.[12]

In defining the desirable worshippers, the primary criterion for Gregoras seems to be simply the Christian faith. Further in the text Gregoras declares that people are allowed, and in fact it is their 'unwritten right', ἀνομοθέτητον δίκαιον,[13] to venerate Demetrius wherever they are. 'In the fields and the cities, and in every place on earth': ἐν ἀγροῖς καὶ πόλεσι καὶ πανταχοῦ τῆς γῆς.[14] They do not have to be in Demetrius's city to do so.

Despite its ring of universality, this seems quite a perplexing remark. The fact that permission is even discussed in the text may seem curious to us at first. It could illuminate Gregoras's train of thought to add that in making this statement he compares the worship of St Demetrius in Thessalonica with that of God in Jerusalem. Gregoras seems familiar with the Jewish laws of worship that were location-specific. Songs of praise were not allowed in exile. In any case, this is another comparison of St Demetrius to God, while Thessalonica is complimented by comparison to the holy city.

Comparisons of Thessalonica to the most celebrated urban centres of the world can be found in abundance in Gregoras and in other encomiasts. They show what was the perception of the city amongst its inhabitants and amongst Byzantines in general. There was no lack of pride surrounding the city of Thessalonica. Indeed, the fervency of the link between local patriotism and the cult of the saint closely parallels the situation in contemporary Italian cities. An obvious example is the cult of St Ambrose in Milan.[15]

The perception of the city as an entity brings me to my next point. There is another echo in the phrase ἐν ἀγροῖς καὶ πόλεσι, apart from the one of the universality of prayer. The set up of a classical city-state is recalled here. This was schematized in ancient Greek tragedy,[16] with one entrance on the theatre stage being for actors coming to stage from the town, and the other for actors coming from the fields. Thessalonica with its hinterland can be compared to a classical city by this association. This is also an indirect comparison to the glory of classical Athens. We should not be surprised that this occurs in the encomia. It is characteristic of the make up of a Byzantine mind to combine classical and theological concepts in this way.

Such parallels went a lot further than just between cities. Demetrius's cult often mirrored that of Christ himself. The core of the festival was modelled on Holy Week and was celebrated over three all-night vigils, as is the custom in the East when paying the last respects to the dead. The imagery of mourning for the dead St Demetrius therefore parallels that for the crucified Christ and blends perfectly with the Christo-centric approach that is at its most prominent in the writings of Nicholas Kavasilas. The celebration of the saint's victory is also a comparison to Christ's resurrection and triumph.

A similar approach is found in the encomium of Constantine Harmenopoulos. He calls St Demetrius's passion 'χριστομίμητον πάθος', a passion that imitates Christ.[17] This is in keeping with the term *Christomimetes*, which was used for emperors. Harmenopoulos is quite specific in his encomium and he goes into physical detail. Moving from the general to the specific, the metaphysical ideal of martyrdom is here expressed in the physical piercing of St

Demetrius's side, which was compared to that of Jesus. The passage is direct and very physical indeed. It has an immediate impact on the reader as it underlines the repetitive action of piercing many times the side of the martyr, as well as his willingness to be slain. St Demetrius is shown here, as he is in other encomia, to have in his mind's eye the death of the Saviour, and that seems to be a major motivating factor in his desire for martyrdom and for imitating His passion willingly ('ἑκὼν'):

> ὅτι χριστομιμήτως τὴν πλευρὰν καὶ οὗτος ἑκὼν ἐνύγη, τούτῳ μόνον ἐνταῦθα τοῦ Σωτῆρος εἴθ' ὑστερήσας εἴτε πλεονεκτήσας, οὐκ ἔχω φάναι, τῷ μυριότρωτον ταύτην σχεῖν[18] [because he had his side pierced willingly in imitation of Christ; but here I cannot really say whether he came short or gained some advantage over the Saviour, by having his side pierced many times].

The suggestion here that St Demetrius might even have excelled Christ in his manner of death is extraordinary. Yet, Harmenopoulos was bearing witness to a distinct trend. As Patriarch John XIV Kalekas complained, in Thessalonica 'St Demetrius was more revered than Christ'. He went on to protest that:

> ὅτι τὸν δούλον πλέον τοῦ δεσπότου τιμώσι, καὶ συναθροίζονται μὲν παμπληθεὶ εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ ἁγίου μεγαλομάρτυρος καὶ μυροβλύτου Δημητρίου, τὸν δὲ ναὸν τοῦ δεσπότου σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ παρατρέχουσιν, εἶπεν αὐτῷ δῆθεν ὁ χαρτοφύλαξ, ὅτι πλέον τιμῶσιν οἱ Θεσσαλονικεῖς τὸν μάρτυρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ[19] [that they honour the slave more than the master, and they gather in great multitude in the church of the holy and great martyr and Myrovlytes Demetrius, and, on the other hand, they run past the church of the Lord and Saviour Christ, and so the chartophylax is alleged to have said of them that they, the Thessalonians, honour more the martyr than Christ].

The frustration of the patriarch in this passage shows the strength of the saint's following. Furthermore, what is brought to mind here is the town plan of Thessalonica, with the multitudes of the faithful rushing to attend a given akolouthia. The church mentioned as being dedicated to the Lord and Saviour Christ must be the Church of the Transfiguration of the Saviour, estimated as having been built in the

fourteenth century. The Church of the Transfiguration is relatively close or certainly at a walking distance to St Demetrius's basilica.[20]

The same spirit of enthusiastic celebration and hyperbolic praise appears in the encomium of Gregory Palamas. He claims that King David foresaw the splendour of St Demetrius and praised him from the depths of the past in the First Psalm: 'Τοῦτον ὁ Δαβὶδ προϊδὼν ἐμακάρισε καὶ ἀνύμνησε «μακάριος», λέγων, «ἀνήρ, ὃς οὐκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν βουλῇ ἀσεβῶν καὶ ἐν ὁδῷ ἁμαρτωλῶν οὐκ ἔστη».' [21] [David having foreseen him in the future, he called him (Demetrius) blessed and exalted him, saying, 'Blessed is the man who has not walked in the will of the impious nor stood in the road of the sinful']. This amounts to a claim that the Psalm was dedicated by King David to St Demetrius. The passage is remarkable not only for the association between the saint and King David but also because it resembles references from the Old Testament to Christ. Of course, Palamas's Orthodoxy was questioned at times, but this will not concern us here.

It seems that all encomiasts were creative in their interpretations. Imaginative associations and new ways of expressing the Christian message are definite features in the encomia. Another example of this comes, again, from Gregoras. He likens the story of St Demetrius to passages from the Gospels in a fascinating and elaborate fashion that also involves the cult of the myrrh. St Demetrius's myrrh was very important to the pilgrims in hope of recovering their health, and its mention would have had a great appeal to them. Here the myrrh of the saint is matched with the myrrh that the penitent woman offered the Lord, and the figure of the woman is matched in turn to the sinful souls of those who go to the saint in order to be healed:

> τοῖς μέντοι τοῦ σωτῆρος ποσὶ τριακοσίων δήπου δηναρίων μύρον ἀκούομεν πόρνην πάλαι προσενεγκοῦσαν, ἀλλ᾽ οὗν ἐκείνη βάσκανον ὀφθαλμὸν ἐκτήσατο θεατὴν τὸν Ἰούδαν (…)· ἐνταῦθα δ᾽ οὔτε δηναρίων ὤνιον τριακοσίων ἔστι τὸ θαῦμα τοῦ μάρτυρος, οὔτε μετρητὸν ὅλως οὔτ᾽ ἦν οὔτ᾽ ἔσται ποτέ, ἀλλ᾽ ἔοικε θαλαττίοις πελάγεσιν, ἀντλουμένοις μὲν ἀεὶ, κενοῦσθαι δ᾽ ουδαμῆ δυναμένοις οὐδέποτε· καὶ πόρνη μὲν ἐκεῖνο γυνὴ τὸ μύρον ἐκόμιζε, τοῦτο δὲ πόρναι καὶ μοιχαλίδες κομίζονται ψυχαί, καὶ βασιλέων κορυφαὶ μετὰ πολλῆς ὑποκύπτουσαι τῆς αἰδοῦς ἀνατίθενται, νοσημάτων

παντοδαπῶν τοῖς πᾶσιν ὂν καθαρτήριον φάρμακον[22] [we hear indeed of the prostitute who of old brought to the feet of the Saviour myrrh to the value of 300 denarii, but obtained the jealous eye of the observing Judas (…); but here the miracle of the martyr is not to be bought with 300 denarii, and it has not been estimated in value, nor will it ever be, but it is like the high sea, always drawn upon, but it can never be feasibly emptied; and the prostitute woman brought that myrrh, but this (myrrh) is conveyed by prostitutes and adulterous souls, and the heads of kings accept it with much respect having bowed down, it (the myrrh) being a cleansing medicine for all against all kinds of diseases]

The meanings and layerings displayed in the speeches are complex and demanding. The pilgrims would have had a great deal being asked of them, having to cope with the physical aspect of attending such a large and long festival, and with assimilating the theological concepts behind it, while fully participating in it emotionally.

The mirroring of St Demetrius's festival in the Passion does not end here. There is a parallel to Easter also in terms of the length of the festivities. There is, in addition, some mention of fasting to prepare for St Demetrius's big day. Harmenopoulos links fasting with purity, giving us some more information about how people prepared ahead of the festival. He thus establishes the mental link between these preparations through atonement and those that are customary during the Holy Week:

ἐπειδὴ καὶ νηστείᾳ τὸν πολιοῦχον ταύτης ἡ πόλις ἐπετείῳ σεμνύνει, τὰς ψυχὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐντεῦθεν ἀγνίζοντες καὶ τὰ σώματα[23] [because also with fasting the city honours its patron saint, therefore purifying their souls and their bodies]

As in every aspect of the life of the Eastern Church, practice and theory go hand in hand in the cult of St Demetrius.

While we have seen the experiential side of the veneration through fasting being mentioned in the work of Harmenopoulos, Philotheos Kokkinos is much more abstract in approach and, although he was also a son of Thessalonica, he had a rather remote way of praising the saint.[24] Kokkinos does not emphasize in his encomium the locality and the personal experience of worship and of the cult but holds up St Demetrius as a universal and therefore abstract symbol of Christian love. In fact, Kokkinos's encomium only partly refers

directly to St Demetrius and his glory and the other part is a reflection on the Lord's command 'ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους' [love one another] that can be found in John's Gospel.[25] Kokkinos elaborates on the theological meaning of St Demetrius's death. He points out how St Demetrius died 'the death for Christ': 'τὸν ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ θάνατον',[26] and how he was deemed worthy of the 'blessed and supernatural' end for Christ: 'τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ὑπερφυοῦς διὰ Χριστὸν ἠξίωται τέλους',[27] and also: 'τοῦ μακαρίου διὰ Χριστὸν ἔτυχε τέλους'[28] [he gained the fortunate end for Christ]. This life on earth was seen as an uninterrupted battle and as a contest, the theological concept and development of which was discussed earlier. The prized death is the natural end of this contest and the intense character of it is described closely by Kokkinos, with echoes of the writings of St Paul: 'τὸν νοητόν φημι καὶ ἀόρατον πόλεμον καὶ τὴν μάχην, μὴ νυκτί, μὴ ὕπνῳ, μὴ τροφῇ, μὴ τῶν ἀναγκαίων (...) διακοπτομένην'[29] [and I say that this perceived and invisible war and battle, is not interrupted by night, or by sleep, or by food, or by any necessities]. The theme of the continuity of the Christian experience comes up here once again. For this uninterrupted war and battle, St Demetrius is acclaimed as a martyr of the sufferings of Christ, «μάρτυς τῶν παθημάτων» αὐτοῦ, after St Peter. For all this he calls him 'καὶ Χριστοῦ μαθητὴν, καὶ ζηλωτὴν, καὶ μιμητὴν'[30] [and a pupil of Christ, and zealot, and imitator].

It would be no exaggeration to say that in the city of Thessalonica the entire year was dedicated to St Demetrius but this votive feeling was intensified with events and personal devotion during the month of October. For the whole month there were celebrations throughout the city, and structured ceremonies every week. The encomia were written to the saint for use during the festival. Gregoras describes the form of the rituals. He shows great admiration for the customs surrounding the festival of the saint. In deference he calls the month of October holy: 'ὁ ἱερός μήν' [the holy month], and says that the whole of the month should be called ἱερομηνία[31] (sacred month) as certain sacred months were called by the ancient Greeks. In fact he uses the term 'οἰκειότερον' as he felt it was much more suitable to call it *hieromenia* than it was in the case of

the ancients. That is because he claims that they were motivated by their antagonism towards one another and not by the object of their devotion. He extends his train of thought to make a proposition regarding the nature of spiritual freedom:

> καὶ πολλῷ δήπου οἰκειότερόν ἐστι ἱερομηνίαν ὅλον αὐτοῖς κεκλῆσθαι τουτονὶ τὸν μῆνα ἢ τοῖς πάλαι Ἕλλησιν ὅστις ἐλέγετο, ἀλλήλοις ἀντιφιλοτιμουμένοις καὶ μιμήσεις ἐξ ἀλλήλων ἐρανιζομένοις· οὐ γὰρ ὡς εἰς ἀρχέτυπα τὰ πάλαι βλέποντες ὑποδείγματα πρὸς τὸ οὕτω φιλότιμον ἐνάγουσιν οὗτοι καθάπερ ἡγεμόνα τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἀρετῆς τὰ τῶν ἄλλων θεσπίσματα δρῶντες· δουλοῖ γάρ πως τὸ ἄφετον τῆς ψυχῆς ἡ τῆς μιμήσεως ἀνάγκη[32] [and it is much more suitable for them to have called the whole of this month holy than the ancient Greeks who called it such, who were antagonistic to one another and imitated each other. For these (i.e. the citizens of Thessalonica) are not driven to such ambition by using as archetypes the old examples, as if they make the master of their own virtue the oracles of others. Because the need for imitation subdues to a certain extent the freedom of the soul].

He is impressed by the love that the people of Thessalonica showed for St Demetrius, which is expressed with ever greater intensity during the festival. This is because in spite of the fact that the Byzantines were extremely devout people, the phenomenon of the cult of St Demetrius in Thessalonica, with its splendour, scale and intensity, was indeed unprecedented. The well-travelled and worldly Gregoras was impressed with what he was seeing:

> …ὁ τῶν πολιτῶν ζῆλος καὶ πόθος, ὃν πρὸς τὸν μέγαν ἐνδείκνυνται τῆς ἀληθείας μάρτυρα καὶ παρ᾽ ὅλον μέντοι τὸν χρόνον, μάλιστα δὲ παρ᾽ ὃν ὁ ἱερός ἐστι μήν[33] [… the passion and longing of the citizens, which they show to the great martyr of the truth indeed for the whole year, but especially when the holy month is here]

The qualities of ζῆλος and πόθος must have been the desired characteristics of a follower of the saint. Here he is called a martyr of the truth, an expression that draws upon the original meaning of the word martyr, as one who witnesses something. The word truth here is synonymous to the Christian faith.

Even so, it is noticeable that the element of pride that can be detected in some of the indigenous encomiasts, such as Kavasilas and Harmenopoulos, is not found in the Constantinopolitans Gregoras or Metochites. That is because the citizens of Thessalonica truly felt a closeness to the saint and thought of him as their own. When authors from Thessalonica write about St Demetrius, these links give a different tone to their work. To take one example, Gregoras pays tribute to St Demetrius's month of October, calling it a feast of feasts and festival of festivals: 'ἑορτὴν ἑορτῶν καὶ πανήγυριν πανηγύρεων'. He does so in the midst of using classical parallels, as for example when he wants to show that he admires Demetrius as Alexander the Great admired Diogenes.[34] Harmenopoulos uses the same figure of speech as Gregoras when he calls St Demetrius the saint of saints: 'καὶ αὐτοῦ, φημί, τοῦ τῶν ἁγίων ἁγίου'[35] [and of him, I mean, the saint of saints]. Instead of relating the festival to a mythological past, however, Harmenopoulos discusses its actual events and rituals. The participation in these rituals meant a lot to Harmenopoulos, as is clear throughout his encomium. Filled with the excitement of the moment, he called the events of the festival most excellent amongst the most excellent: 'περιφανῆ[36] γὰρ τοῖς περιφανέσι καὶ τὰ γινόμενα'[37] [the things that take place are most excellent amongst the most excellent].

The myrrh which exuded from Demetrius's tomb was also extensively discussed by the encomiasts. Obviously believers would have wanted to be satisfied as to how the myrrh came into existence. The belief that the saint's body was cast into a well, 'ἐν κατωτάτοις φρέατος πυθμέσι'[38] [in the lowest foundation of the well], from which thereafter *myron* flowed, is first encountered in Gregoras's encomium, written in about 1330.[39] In this passage, quoted below, Homeric undertones of the bodies of the unfortunate enemy given to animals as food strike the reader. This makes an indirect link between St Demetrius and the youthful fighting heroes of the great epics that Byzantines knew and studied avidly. In this passage there is also a more abstract allusion, with the glory of St Demetrius being likened to overwhelming sunlight that could not be extinguished:

παρενθήκη ἦν αὐτοῦ τῆς κακίας οὐκ ὀρνέοις βρῶμα καὶ κυσὶ τὸ μαρτυρικὸν ἐκεῖνο σῶμα ποιεῖσθαι, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν κατωτάτοις φρέατος πυθμέσι ῥιπτεῖν, ἵνα μὴ σαφὴς τῶν ἐκείνου μηχανημάτων ἔλεγχος ᾖ τοῖς ὁρῶσιν, ὅμοια τῇ τῶν νεφῶν ἀκοσμίᾳ δρῶν καὶ αὐτός, ἐπειδὰν ἀνθίστασθαι καὶ ἀντιπαλαμᾶσθαι πρὸς τὴν πλουσίαν ἐκείνην ἀπορροὴν τοῦ παγκοσμίου πειρῶνται φωτός[40] [an addition to his (i.e. Maximian's) wickedness was the fact that he did not make this body, that was tortured to death for Christ, food for the birds of prey and the dogs, but threw it in the bottom of the deepest well, so that reproach of his ways would not be clear to the spectators. He acted very much like the unruliness of clouds when they try to resist and work against this rich flow of the universal light (i.e. sunlight)]

This ties in with the way other Byzantine writers expressed themselves. For example, allusions to the divine light are frequent in the writings of Symeon. He praises the monks Maximos and Kallistos Xanthopoulos for the spiritual fruits they have received through their monastic path; those become a pledge (ἀρραβών) of the divine light that belongs to the celestial life.[41] The same pledge comes into his interpretation of the imperial office: '῞Ενθα δὴ καὶ πλησίον ἵσταται τῶν ἱερέων εὐχομένων ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, τυχεῖν τῆς βασιλείας Χριστοῦ. Μετὰ μικρὸν δὲ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτὴν ἐν ἀῤῥαβῶνι λαμβάνει'[42] [So there he stands close to the clerics who are praying in his favour, to gain the kingdom of Christ. As a small token it is that he receives this kingdom, in betrothal]. As for the image of the open heavens, it is also prominent in the discussion of the consecration of the temple: 'ὅτι τὸν Χριστὸν τυποῦσιν οἱ μάρτυρες, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ἀρχιερεύς· ὁ δὲ ναὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν'[43] [that the martyrs typify Christ, and the archbishop himself (does); the temple on the other hand (typifies) heaven]. This visionary image is persistent throughout Symeon's writings.

Referring back to Gregoras, we must mention for the record that the relics of the saint were not in the well. They had been divided up, and some had been taken to the West between 1204 and 1224.[44] The battle for saints' relics was quite common in medieval times, and Constantinople had often bid for relics of St Demetrius before they were lost to the West.

Gregoras's remark about the well is repeated in other sources, amongst which are two encomia to St Demetrius by Metropolitans Isidore and Symeon. The introduction of this new belief was connected to the constitution of the *myron*. The mixing of it with water from the well raised questions about its authenticity amongst the faithful. In the opinion of Charalambos Bakirtzis, the encomium of Demetrius Chrysoloras at the beginning of the fifteenth century had the purpose of reassuring the public about the nature of the myrrh.[45] This opinion is easily arrived at by the fact that the myrrh of St Demetrius is included in the title of the encomium, it being as follows: 'Τοῦ λογιωτάτου κυροῦ Δημητρίου τοῦ Χρυσολωρᾶ, Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον καὶ εἰς τὰ μύρα' [Of the most intellectual master Demetrius Chrysoloras, Discourse on the great Demetrius and on the myrrh].[46] It is argued here, however, that this encomium conceals much deeper issues that go much beyond the myrrh of its title and an appraisal of it is given in the next chapter. Going back to the discussion of the myrrh, John Stavrakios had already expressed his doubts about the whole subject of the *myron* in the second half of the thirteenth century.[47] In any case, the *myron* was about healing and healing was a major part of St Demetrius's cult. Apparently 'a hospital was set up in the late sixth and early seventh centuries somewhere in the north part of the basilica, perhaps in the north wing of the transept of the basilica' that was dedicated to St Demetrius in Thessalonica.[48]

Not only has Gregoras left us the charming legend of the well but his text is also a main source for our understanding of the saint's festival in his time. The rituals must have been complex enough to require being reinforced in the minds of the participants through descriptions in the encomia every year. In their encomia Gregoras, Isidore and Harmenopoulos explain the structure of the celebrations. Gregoras in characteristic classicising manner likens the four focal points of the festivities to the passage of four years between two ancient Olympics, and therefore indirectly compares St Demetrius to Zeus:

> ἐκείνοι γὰρ τετραετηρίδων σέβοντες περιόδους, ἐν τέτταρσιν ἔτεσι μίαν ἐτέλουν πανήγυριν τῷ Διΐ, τὴν τῶν Ὀλυμπίων· οὗτοι δὲ καθ' ἕνα

τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τέτταρας ἀεὶ τελοῦσι πανηγύρεις τῷ πολλῷ Δημητρίῳ[49] [because they (i.e. the ancient Greeks), observing periods of four years, celebrated one public festival in honour of Zeus, that of the Olympics; but these (i.e. the people of Thessalonica) within each year they hold four festivals for the mighty Demetrius]

He makes a parallel with the four-way division of the *tetrachordon* [four-stringed instrument], a reminder that he also had a keen interest in musical theory:

ὥσπερ γὰρ ἑνός τινος σώματος ὄντος τοῦ ἔτους κατά τινας λόγους τῶν τετραχόρδων ἁρμονικοὺς τετραχῇ διαιροῦσιν οἱ χαριέστεροι τῶν σοφῶν, οὕτω καὶ αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἱερᾶς ταυτησὶ τελετῆς τετραχῇ διαιρεῖται μυστήριον[50] [exactly as the year being one body is divided four ways by the most graceful of the philosophers according to the harmonic laws of the musical tetrachords, in the same way the mystery of this sacred rite is divided by them in four parts]

That is because although the memory of St Demetrius is now celebrated on the 26 October, in Byzantine times there were three other feasts to his honour in the year.[51] Also, the festival itself was divided into four parts. Gregoras relates the four feasts to the four seasons:

ὡς ἀναλογεῖν τὴν μὲν βασιλικήν τε καὶ πρώτην πανήγυριν τῇ τοῦ ἔτους ἀρχῇ καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς, τήν γε μὴν δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην, ἃς δὴ ποιμένες ἱεροὶ καὶ μοναδικῶν ἀνδρῶν τελοῦσι συντάγματα, ὥσπερ ἐκ διαδοχῆς καινοτέραν ἀεὶ δημιουργοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς ἡδονὴν καὶ χάριν ἀλλαττόμενοι χάριτος τῷ χειμῶνι καὶ τῷ ἦρι, ἠδ᾽ οἱ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης ἰδίως οἰκήτορες ἐκλεξάμενοι καὶ μεθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἄγοντες ὀκτὼ πρὸς τὸν πόθον ἀφοσιοῦνται τοῦ μάρτυρος, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἐπαναλήψεως τὴν μαρτυρικὴν ἐκείνην αὖθις ἀνακαλούμενοι θυμηδίαν, τῷ κρατίστῳ τοῦ ἔτους εἰκάζεσθαι μέρει, τῷ θέρει[52] [so the first celebration, when the basileus is present, corresponds to our beginning of the year. The second and third, which the holy shepherds and the regiments of monks run, exactly so that through succession they always create new pleasure for themselves exchanging grace for grace, corresponds to winter and spring. And this one which the inhabitants of this city have chosen, they lead for eight days after the Day (i.e. 26 October) by dedicating themselves to the love of the Martyr, as if they summon once again that spiritual pleasure, corresponds to the best time of the year, the summer]

The way Gregoras describes the spiritual pleasures of the monks is in agreement with their own quest, and in exchanging 'grace for grace' one can read the constant pursuit of spiritual refinement. Also, from the above excerpt we can see that the main festival, the one that was held in October and was in some passages classified as a spiritual spring, and here as a summer, had an eight day feast period after the day of the saint's memory.[53]

When examining the encomia as sources for how the festival was celebrated, that written by Constantine Harmenopoulos occupies a special place. It was not only that it was written by a layman for use as a sermon rather than as a literary piece, as Gregoras's was. It is the only text that supplies us with information on that part of the festival that was celebrated in the church of the Acheiropoietos. Its first words, which also serve as a title, claim that the encomium was actually delivered in the Acheiropoietos during the *proeortia*, that is to say the ceremonies leading to the main celebrations on the saint's day:

> Τοῦ πανσεβάστου νομοφύλακος καὶ κριτοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Ἁρμενοπούλου, Λόγος εἰς τὴν προεόρτιον ἑορτὴν τοῦ μεγάλου Δημητρίου τοῦ Μυροβλύτου, ἥτις ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου τῆς Ἀχειροποιήτου τελεῖται.[54] [Of the most honourable law-protector and judge of Thessalonica, Constantine Harmenopoulos, Speech on the pre-celebration of the feast of the great Demetrius the Myrovlytes, which takes place in the church of the most holy Mother of God, not made by Human Hands]

Nevertheless, Papadopoulos believes that Harmenopoulos delivered his speech earlier in the month, and not on the eve of the festival.[55]

Reading Harmenopoulos's encomium, one gets the impression that the role of the Acheiropoietos in the festival may have been of relatively recent date. Indeed the name itself might only recently have been attached to the building. At one point, Harmenopoulos suggests that the church should be called Acheiropoietos, which would imply that this was not the name that the church had at the time: 'καὶ ταύτης αὐτὸν τῆς Ἀχειροποιήτου προσρήσεως, ἀξιοῦν ἐπῄει τολμῆσαι' [and for this I would dare to make the request of the title of the Acheiropoietos for it]. Xyngopoulos believes that the church

was called Panagia Hodegetria when the encomium was delivered and that there was an icon of the Virgin Mary Hodegetria, as opposed to the Virgin in prayer, which is how Harmenopoulos describes the Acheiropoietos icon: 'οὕτως ὄρθιος, ἱκέσιος ἐσχημάτισται' [thus it was formed into one who was standing in prayer].[56]

Whatever the truth of that, by the late fourteenth century the Acheiropoietos church was playing a central role in the festival. In his encomium, Harmenopoulos explains why, namely that the site of the building had played a part in the saint's martyrdom. He describes a secret place of early Christian gathering, called Kataphyge: 'ἐκ τῆς οὕτω λεγομένης Καταφυγῆς'[57] [from the so-called Kataphyge], where Demetrius is supposed to have taught. This place is identified with the Acheiropoietos. The Kataphyge is also mentioned in Palamas's encomium.[58] Palamas also makes a mention of the litany and representation of martyrdom that took place during the festival, as if to an audience that is very familiar with the procedure:

> Ταῦθ᾽ ἡμεῖς εἰκονίζοντες κατ᾽ ἔτος εἰκότως, ἐκεῖ μὲν τῆς πανηγύρεως ποιούμεθα τὴν ἀρχήν, ὧδε δὲ τὴν τελείωσιν. Ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ μάρτυς οὕτως εἶχεν ἑλκόμενος εἰς σφαγὴν τηνικαῦτα διὰ Χριστόν, ὡς εἰς ἑορτὴν καὶ θυμηδίαν τὴν μεγίστην καλούμενος[59] [Of course we, depicting those things every year, make the beginning of the festival there, and here we make the finish. Because also the martyr was thus led to the slaughter for Christ, as if being invited to a celebration, and to the greatest enjoyment].

This gives a cyclic theme to the festival's structure. The word Kataphyge means 'refuge', and accordingly doubles as a symbol of Christian faith and hope. This corresponds with the explanation Palamas gives, as to the origin of the name:

> Τῆς οὖν ἀσεβείας ἐπικρατούσης, ἐπεὶ τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας παρρησίας χώραν οὐκ εἶχεν, ἐμφιλοχωρῶν ὁ μάρτυς τοῖς ὑπογείοις ἐκείνοις, μετεδίδου τοῖς προσιοῦσι τῆς οὐρανίου διδασκαλίας καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀσεβείας, οἱονεί τινος πολυκυμάντου κλύδωνος, ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν καταφεύγουσι τὸν ὄντως εὔδιον λιμένα τῆς εὐσεβείας μετ᾽ ἀδείας τὰ Χριστιανῶν ὑπετίθετο καὶ ἐτέλει· καὶ οὕτω καταφυγὴ μὲν ὁ θειότατος ὑπῆρχε τηνικαῦτα μάρτυς πάντων τῶν εὐσευβῶν αἱρουμένων, Καταφυγὴ δὲ καὶ ὁ τόπος ἐντεῦθεν ἐκλήθη.[60] [When impiety was dominant and there was no freedom of speech about piety, the martyr

> frequented with pleasure this underground place and he communicated the heavenly teaching to those who drew near, and to those who came to him for refuge from impiety, as from a turbulent tempest, he who was the real calm harbour of faith with freedom set before them matter Christian and initiated them; and thus he was the most divine one, the refuge of all those who elected piety, and thereupon they named that place Kataphyge]

The word παρρησία [freedom of speech] has rich theological connotations. In this context it refers to the boldness with which Demetrius declared his faith though it could also refer to the ability of holy men to speak directly to God and thus intercede for the rest of humanity.[61] In its first sense, the word ties in with the Christian ideal of the martyr-athlete, which has been explored in a previous chapter. St Stephen, to whom St Demetrius was likened by being attributed the epithet *stephanitis*, was admired greatly for his παρρησία.

Going back to Harmenopoulos and the church of the Acheiropoietos, from his encomium it transpires that Acheiropoietos must have been used as a major part of the October festivities every year, with an encomiastic speech planned at a fixed time before the twenty-sixth. The church was dedicated to St Demetrius alongside the Virgin Mary and provided a setting for joint veneration of the Virgin and St Demetrius.[62] According to Harmenopoulos, there was a much-venerated icon of St Demetrius there. A celebration in honour of the saint took place there every Friday.[63] There was also a special celebration on the Friday before the saint's name day:

> Τοῦτο δεῖν ποιεῖν ἐπέγνω καὶ κατὰ τὴν πρὸ τῆς τοῦ μεγάλου τούτου κυρίας τελετῆς ἕκτην τῆς ἑβδομάδος συμπίπτουσαν (…) τῇ Θεομήτορι τούτου συμπροεορτάζουσα[64] [And it was known that this had to be done, on the day that falls on the sixth day of the week (i.e. Friday) before the main celebration of this great one … pre-celebrating the Mother of God together with him]

Friday was traditionally a day of veneration of the Virgin in the Greek Church and is the day on which the famous akolouthia of Chairetismoi is celebrated during Lent.[65]

As with the sections of praise for the city of Thessalonica that can be found in many of the encomia to St Demetrius, Harmenopoulos provides a section where he displays the many reasons why the church

of the Acheiropoietos is so widely admired.[66] So his encomium contains not an *ekphrasis* of the whole city but instead one of the particular church. This must have been especially effective, as his speech was delivered in the church talked about, on a day that it must have looked particularly splendid, having been prepared to do so for the festival. Harmenopoulos precisely talks about the beauty of the church. He gives an evocative description of the columns of the church that apparently held the roof in such a way that it made people think that the whole building was in heaven. This made Harmenopoulos suggest that not only the eponymous icon not-made-by-human-hands but the whole church of the Acheiropoietos, too, was miraculous work.

Harmenopoulos was very successful in his encomium in expressing his complete amazement in the presence of either physical or supernatural beauty. Still, it was not only the architectural beauty of the Acheiropoietos that had made it an attractive venue for the festival. Its location in the heart of the town made it an ideal interim destination, as it was half way between the churches of St Sophia and St Demetrius, and at a suitable distance for a litany.[67] We are fortunate to have such accounts of the festival that are so location-specific. The heady mixture of psalmody, incense, evocative prayer, and the spectacular light that are present in those descriptions corresponds to working churches in the city today.

Harmenopoulos expressed in his encomium the exuberance of lavish celebrations that took place in the fourteenth century but in later years when things were not going so well for the Byzantine empire it appears that the economic limitations eventually caught up with the organisers of the festival. Therefore during the later years, the external pressures on the social and liturgical life in Thessalonica made clerics feel they had to consolidate the rituals involved in the itinerary. That was necessary both as a way of defining the procedures in order to protect the faith and to make them more economical to run, at a time when resources were not as readily available as they might have been. The Metropolitan Symeon, or somebody working in his close environment while he was archbishop, gives a detailed account of the processes of the ritual in his 'precise order', 'Διάταξιν ἀκριβή τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ Ἁγίου Δημητρίου'. This involves descriptions of the

services, the litany, and the ceremonies in and out of the church.[68] The Διάταξις was written between the years 1419 and 1429, and it is thought that Symeon may have had to simplify the pattern of the celebrations because of the difficult political situation. The stop at the church of the Acheiropoietos, from where the famous encomium by Harmenopoulos would have been delivered, was in the later years probably omitted from the itinerary.[69]

Some other aspects important in the veneration of St Demetrius that are rather neglected in the work of the more spiritual and philosophical writers of the time are expounded by Harmenopoulos. He does refer to theological matters, especially when he links the veneration of the Virgin and of St Demetrius, which is the main theme of his encomium but he also relates to the physical elements of the rituals, giving a testimony as if from the point of view of an ordinary spectator who would have participated at the festival and allowed himself to be carried along by its splendid display. A layman's view in that respect is valuable, because it brings out elements that would have appealed to the great numbers of pilgrims who were present.

His descriptions give the impression of celebrations of great brilliance, in terms both of the light and the music present in the church. His description of the building of the church of the Acheiropoietos, where his speech took place, is both detailed and enthusiastic. The theological link made between this life and the other is clear, liturgical splendour symbolizing supernatural glory. Such basic theological concepts were part of the shared ground of Byzantine intellectuals and commonly appear in the works of lay writers. Lay writers display considerable knowledge of theology in their work, which shows how deeply it permeated Byzantine society. In his encomium Harmenopoulos is observing the progress of the day, leading his audience with his words. He is enjoying during the ceremony 'τὴν ἐναρμόνιον καὶ μουσικωτάτην ἐμμελῆ ψαλμῳδίαν'[70] [the harmonious and most musical melodic psalmody]. The litany arrives at the church with odes and divine choral songs of triumph (paeans): 'μετ᾽ ᾠδῆς (…) καὶ θείου παιῶνος'.[71] It is interesting here that the ancient musical terms of the ode and the paean are used, as opposed to Byzantine forms for a hymn like the

Canon, the Kontakion or the Troparion. Both the ode and the paean have celebratory overtones, and maybe that is the reason why the use of those classical and pagan terms here is deemed appropriate. The ode is a song of praise, and the paean a song of triumph. In reality such forms would have not been used as part of any Christian rite. The use of those terms is metaphorical.

The spectacle must have been a unique experience, as the light during the celebrations must have been magnificent: 'καὶ φωτοχυσίας ὅτι πολλῆς, ὡς καὶ πάσας φωτὶ τὰς ἀγυιὰς καταστράπτεσθαι' [and there was a great stream of light, and all the streets were brilliant with light]. The church of the Acheiropoietos 'τῶν καλλίστων εἶναι καὶ περικαλλεστάτων ἐπὶ γῆς θεαμάτων καὶ θαυμάτων' [is amongst the loveliest and most beautiful spectacles and wonders on earth].[72]

The sense of wonder that must have overtaken the speaker is encapsulated very well in a dilemma he admits for himself early in his speech, whether to praise first the object of the ceremony, St Demetrius, or the manner of the praise itself:

> Ἀλλὰ τί πρῶτον ἐνταῦθ' ἐρῶ; Τίνα δὲ πρῶτον, καὶ σθένος ὅσον ἔστι μοι λογικόν εὐφημήσω; Πότερον, τὸν εὐφημούμενον, ἢ τὴν εὐφημίαν αὐτήν; [73] [But what shall I say first here? What shall I praise first, and with all the ability of speech that I possess? Which one, the praised (i.e. St Demetrius), or the praise itself?]

He elaborates the dichotomy of his thought further when he says:

> καὶ ὁ περὶ ἀδριάντος ἐρῶν καὶ τὴν οὗ ὁ ἀνδριὰς ἐστὶ καὶ ὑφ' οὗ γέγονε, τοῦ μέν, μεγαλουργίαν, τοῦ δ' εὐφυΐαν ἐξειπεῖν ἀναγκάζεται[74] [and he who talks about a statue, is compelled to talk both of the greatness of him whose the statue is and of the cleverness of him who created it]

To apply the paradigm to our case, the statue is St Demetrius and the maker is the city. This is an interesting way of conceptualizing the cult because it recognizes the importance that the human factor has to play even in divine things. In other words, there would be no great saint without great followers. This is high praise to the participants, and also quite pragmatic in its approach. The cleverness of this remark has

to be the way it is concealed in pretty language. Being orally delivered, the passage would have just left the listener with the impression of some interesting parallel, but without giving them the time to take it to its logical conclusion. It would be interesting to know what the great theological minds of the time would have made of this statement, had they scrutinized it.

In the way that it is written, Harmenopoulos's encomium emerges much more as a part of the seasonal festival than some of the other encomia, which have a feel of isolation and autonomy and of theological or philological treatises in their own right. This is true not only of the flashy literary exercises but also of some of the encomia that were intended and indeed delivered as sermons.

Harmenopoulos does neither escape nor avoid the trappings of the form within which he is composing. He writes in a classicizing style, as it would be expected of him, but despite that, the piece retains a freshness and flexibility. Some ecclesiastical and poetical language filters through the encomium, as are glimpses of an emotional response. There is a spoken feel in Harmenopoulos's piece and the tendency to address his audience directly and refer to their experience of the moment, of which he feels a part. He addresses his audience with excitement, calling them lovers of God and lovers of ceremonies; the latter especially must have been a particularly Byzantine virtue: 'ὦ φιλόθεοι καὶ φιλέορτοι'.[75] He gives his personal impression: ''Εγὼ δέ, οὕτω ταῦθ᾽ ὁρῶν, τέθηπα καὶ ἐκπέπληγμαι[76] [When I see these things thus, am amazed and surprised]. A little later he says: 'ἐκπέπληγμαι τοίνυν, ὡς ἔφην, ὑπεράγαμαί τε καὶ καταινῶ'[77] [I am surprised, therefore, as I said, and overjoyed, and I give my endorsement]. The repetitiveness of his speech conveys the emotion and the enthusiasm that he felt and also the importance of charismatic delivery for an oral piece like this. The immediacy makes this a valuable document and gives the modern reader some insight into how it actually felt being at the festival.

This technique of direct reference to one's audience is very effective and Gregory Palamas in his encomium has a similar moment of spontaneity, when he says to his congregation:

> Ποθεῖτε πάντες, εὖ οἶδα, καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς κατασχέσεως ὅπῃ(…)[78]
> [All of you want, I know it well (to learn) what exactly (was) the manner of his arrest…]

There are certain moments in a speech where the speaker has allowed for some flexibility and is able to respond to the way the audience is reacting to what they are being exposed to. It is very satisfying in a text to come across such moments of audience interaction. In terms of the discussion of the alleged rigidity of Byzantine literature and its failure to be spontaneous, such instances feed into the debate and support the view that these texts are written with warmth and passion. It is in fact quite difficult to be formal and uncommunicative when addressing an audience in direct speech, especially an audience so passionate about their worship and their dedication to the saint.

This view is supported by what is said in the sources. In his speech, Harmenopoulos praises the citizens of Thessalonica for their devotion to St Demetrius, their fervent participation in the celebrations and their piety. We have seen similar examples of praise in Gregoras. Thessalonica and its inhabitants feature extensively in the encomia in general and the praise of the city is seen by most encomiasts as part of the praise of its special saint.

Returning to the information provided by the encomia on the festival, they also bear witness to the role played in the festival by monks and monasteries. In a deeply hesychast city, it is hardly a surprise that the monks should play a major role in the most important religious festival of the year. Metropolitan Isidore's homily to St Demetrius compares the monks of Thessalonica to the saint in terms of their asceticism.[79] Symeon tells us that the brethren were heavily involved in the processions in St Demetrius's honour. The third day of the festival was in fact given over to the monastic community.[80] A word of recognition for the contribution of the monastic orders to the festival can be found in the passage of the four seasons by Gregoras, quoted above. Gregoras was a known anti-hesychast but not anti-monk. In any case, his praise given to the largely hesychast brethren has even greater value and demonstrates how St Demetrius was a force for unity in a divisive time for Thessalonica. He describes the

monks as 'holy shepherds' and stresses their integral role in the festival as they 'always create new pleasure for themselves, exchanging grace for grace'.[81]

An insight into the importance of St Demetrius to the monastic life in Thessalonica but in a totally different way can be found in another encomium, that of the founder and abbot of the Nea Moni in Thessalonica, Makarios Choumnos.[82] Although Laourdas does not rate this encomium very highly, he recognises one element of originality in it.[83] This is the fact that this encomium is a rare example in the extant corpus which is written for the benefit of the brethren alone and is not addressed to a large audience of worshippers as a panegyric speech in the festival of the saint. Two encomia are exceptions to this. One is the encomium of Isidore to the monks of Thessalonica in the context of the festival of St Demetrius,[84] the other is that by Choumnos under consideration here.

Choumnos's encomium was not written for public consumption but in the context of trying to improve the devotional life of the brothers in his monastery from his position as an abbot and as a spiritual leader. This meant that he could be intriguingly direct in what he says. His exasperation and despair at the poor performance of the brethren is evident in his outspoken account. There is a sense of personal failure in his text, as he sees the failings of the brethren as partly his responsibility. His urgent appeal to St Demetrius for help comes with his own resignation to not being strong enough to cope alone. It also has the merit of being quite unguarded and voices the author's anger and frustration.

Choumnos's encomium also contrast with those that were a purely literary form, designed to display the knowledge and skill of their author and in no way intended to be used as a speech, such as those of Theodore Metochites and Nicholas Kavasilas.[85] These productions were circulated amongst the educated classes of Constantinople and Thessalonica and were a display of their authors' intellectual range. Learned Byzantines enjoyed writing them because their skill, classical and biblical knowledge, virtuosity, and compositional ability were openly exhibited in such pieces.

Turning now to the content of Choumnos's encomium, not surprisingly he refers to St Demetrius in the context of coping with the

inner life of the monastery. In doing so, he is as fervent as the other encomiasts, those who praise the participants for the beauty of the celebrations. His encomium is written from a different perspective and provides a contrast to these works for being a prayer not of thanksgiving but of exasperation and impatience. Furthermore he uses direct and abrupt phrasing and strong images to express his unrest, including the metaphor of the sea. In his encomium he extends a prayer for the guidance of his monks by Christ and St Demetrius, and by acknowledging his need for help he invites the saint to accept his prayer and to lead his brothers:

> ὑπὲρ τε τῶν συμπατριωτῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ ἧς προΐσταμαι ποίμνης συμπρεσβευτὴν προσλαμβάνω, ἀξίωσόν με τῆς δωρεᾶς ὧν ἐφίεμαι, ὑπὲρ ὧν πρεσβεύω, καὶ τρέψον μοι τὴν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπαινετὴν λύπην εἰς χαράν, ἵνα μὴ ἐν ἐμοὶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἔχῃς καύχημα[86]
> [and in favour of my fellow countrymen and of this flock of which I am the head, I employ you as my joint ambassador. Make me worthy of the gift for which I long and for which I intercede, and turn the praiseworthy sorrow inside myself that I have for them into gladness, so that not only in myself, but also in them you may have pride].

This prayer seems to be unusual and untypical, not only for its boldness and resolute attitude but also for its apparent lack of lowliness and submissiveness to the will of the saint and of God. Boldness in prayer is not unknown within the Christian tradition and the example of the wrestling Jacob has made it into a Christian virtue. Therefore it does not appear to be a derivative or routinely written piece, as Laourdas suggested, but an individualistic prayer, worthy of our attention. Passages of wishing for greater discipline in following the monastic path and of being critical of slack behaviour are to be expected normally in a *typikon* and not in an encomium: 'λυσιτελοῦσιν οὗτοι τῶν ἀνέσεων μᾶλλον'[87] [they rather take advantage of the luxuries]. The abbot is not only strong in his appeal to the saint, but he does not hesitate to show clear signs of exasperation: 'Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἰλιγγίασα, περὶ τούτου προτρεπόμενος τούτους καὶ παρακαλῶν καὶ μὴ παραδεχόμενος'[88] [And myself, I have become from now on dizzy with effort, urging them towards that direction and pleading, and not

receiving]. It really feels as if he is alone in prayer, and it is amazing that he used this speech in front of his brethren and in memory of the saint. They would have made a fascinating audience. The tone of the encomium in parts gets heavier and progressively more and more weary, and even unintentionally humorous.

In using the form of an encomium to St Demetrius to criticise his wayward flock, Choumnos employs the striking and popular Byzantine metaphor of the sea to show how much human affairs are in divine hands:

> δι᾽ ἑνὸς τῶν δούλων σου (…) ὁ τὴν ἁλμυρὰν καὶ ἄποτον τῶν ὑδάτων φύσιν εἰς γλυκυτάτην καὶ πότιμον μετασκευάσας, ὁ θαλάσσαν μαινομένην διὰ τοῦ εἰπεῖν «σιώπα», «πεφίμωσο» εἰς βαθυτάτην γαλήνην μεταποιήσας (…) ὁ τῇ ἀσθενεῖ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων διὰ τὸ τῆς προαιρέσεως σαθρὸν καὶ ἐξίτηλον δύναμιν τοσαύτην παρασχών[89] [through one of your servants … the One who transformed the salty and undrinkable nature of the waters into one that is most sweet and drinkable, the One who transformed the raging sea to the deepest calm by saying 'Peace, be still' … the One who has provided the weak nature of men because of the unsound and evanescent character of their will with so much strength].

St Demetrius is another servant through whom the Lord is said to perform all great things. Choumnos makes this clear by referring immediately afterwards to the abundance of the myrrh: 'ἀείροα νάματα πλουσίως πηγάζειν παρασκευάσας'[90] [You continuously make ever-flowing streams to outpour richly]. Of course, unlike the work of Harmenopoulos, Choumnos's encomium would never have been heard publicly but only by the monks of his monastery. Strictly speaking, therefore, it played no part in the festival. It is, however, a good example of the way that the genre could be adapted to a particular purpose.

Finally, a few points will be made on two other encomia, those of George Scholarios and Isidore Glavas. If the exasperated tone of his prayer was the most surprising element in the encomium by Choumnos, Scholarios has an even more peculiar approach in urging his flock to the Christian life. He embarks on a detailed and gruesome inventory of the instruments and means of torture to be found in Hell,

which guide one's imagination to strong visual images, comparable to those of siege and battle. He uses this lengthy description as the first part of a comparison between the endless torments of hell-fire and the like, and the painless and easy exit of this life by the way of Christian martyrdom: 'τομὴ ξίφους μόνον πρὸς τὴν ὑπεξαγωγὴν τοῦ παρόντος ἤρκεσε βίου'.[91] [the edge of a sword is all it took for the retirement from the present life]. Reading his piece, it really feels as if death by sword is so desirable and easy! So persuasive is he. It is not surprising, then, that St Demetrius in this work is praised primarily for his ardent desire to die. Of course if that is seen as part of his attempt to make sense of the Ottoman occupation, his eagerness to stress that nothing can stop one from loving Christ is very straightforward to understand.

In Scholarios's encomium, which is dominated by the wish to die for the love of Christ, the death of St Demetrius is described as being brought about not by six soldiers, as in the text by Chrysoloras, but by thousands. This in the way of thinking of Scholarios means that St Demetrius died multiple times for the sake of Christ, and his death has therefore greater value: 'καὶ οὐχ ἅπαξ λοιπὸν ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μάρτυς Δημήτριος ὑπεραπέθανε τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀγαπήσεως, ἀλλὰ μυριάκις, εἴ γε μυρίαν ἡ στρατιωτικὴ ἀπήνεια τὴν λόγχην ἔθιξε κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ'[92] [and so the martyr of Christ, Demetrius, died for the love of Christ not once but a myriad times, exactly as the military harshness struck the lance against him].

Before Scholarios, Metropolitan Isidore Glavas paid tribute to the saint with an equally startling overstatement. He used about St Demetrius the evocative and stylish quotation: '«οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ κόσμος ἀντάξιος μιᾶς ψυχῆς»'[93] [the whole world is not equal to the worth of one soul]. To show visually the need with which the faithful long for him, he gave this very lively metaphor from Psalm 42: 'διψητικῶς ὡς ἔλαφοι πρὸς πηγὰς θέοντες ὧδε εἰς κόρον τῶν μύρων μεταλαμβάνουσι'[94] [with great thirst like deer that look towards the sources of water, exactly in that way they commune of the myrrh to satiety]. It is remarkable that he uses the word μεταλαμβάνουσι here, the same word that is used for the communion of the Sacrament. Animals are not employed frequently in theological treatises to portray emotions, and such an occurrence was

even more unexpected in view of the disposition of the writer under consideration.

In another instance, and to express the mortal danger that Thessalonica escaped – thanks to St Demetrius – Isidore used a particularly impressive version of the sea metaphor that we have come across before:

> τρόπαια (…) δι᾽ ὧν οἱ τήνδε τὴν γῆν οἰκοῦντες γαλήνης ἀπήλαυσαν ὑπερηδίστης ἐκ θανατουργοῦ χειμῶνος καὶ κλύδωνος διασωθέντες ἀπειλοῦντος τὸ σκάφος τουτὶ, φημὶ δὲ τὴν Θεσσαλονίκην, αὔτανδρον ὡς εἰπεῖν εἰς βυθὸν αἵματος καταδῦσαι[95] [trophies … through which those who inhabit this land have enjoyed the most pleasurable repose, having been saved from deathly winter and tempest that was threatening this ship, I mean of course Thessalonica, so to speak from sinking in an abyss of blood with all hands].

It is in that context of mortal jeopardy that the myrrh of St Demetrius is said by him to expel suffering: ‘τὴν ὀδύνην ἐξωθεῖ’.[96] In that aspect it reminds one of the Homeric *pharmakon nepenthes* (potion of oblivion) that was drunk to suspend the sorrow of heroes. What is fascinating about Isidore is that he uses his classical background as part of his narrating palette, without the need for direct reference, or for spelling out the web of those literary relationships, but instead he is using this way of making associations as part of the rich fabric of his writing.

In conclusion, the evidence that the encomia provide for the festival of St Demetrius has been surveyed and a number of insights have been offered. The information given is sometimes a straight description but often it is rather more subtle than that. By reading an encomium that was designed to hold the attention of a large and excited crowd in a church, their understanding of the event comes to life as the speaker sought both to direct and harness their enthusiasm. Even those speeches that were not designed for public consumption, such as those of Gregoras and Choumnos, betray in their concerns, metaphors, and portrayals what it was that the festival meant to the author and his more restricted audience. They are therefore an indispensable guide to the late Byzantine mind.

Chapter Four
Signs of the Times:
Responses to Contemporary Life

So far we have looked at the encomia from different perspectives. We have seen how literary and theological models influenced their composition as well as how stylistic traits played their part. We have also seen that the festival itself was recorded in the encomia to St Demetrius in all its glory, giving us an insight to the life of late Byzantium. Yet the encomia were capable not only of recording contemporary life but also of responding to it. How authors reacted to events that took place and issues that concerned them will be the subject of this chapter which looks at the encomia as commentaries on contemporary events and problems. The rigid and stylized genre, far from excluding such subject matter, provided a form through which it could be publicly discussed. It also had the advantage of providing a way in which the orator could make a controversial point without giving offence or endangering his career.

To take one example, contemporary events are discussed in detail in the encomia of Gabriel of Thessalonica. One of them, entitled '῾Ομιλία ῥηθεῖσα ὅτε διεφθάρησαν οἱ Τοῦρκοι παρὰ τῶν Σκυθῶν'[1] [A speech delivered when the Turks were destroyed by the Scythians] is still a work in praise of the saint. In it, Gabriel breathed a sigh of relief in response to the news of the victory of Timur (Tamerlane) over the Ottoman Turks at the battle of Ankara in July 1402. His speech is filled with examples from the Old Testament where God extinguished his enemies and made arrogant peoples perish. This defeat, that made it possible for Thessalonica to return to Byzantine administration, was greeted with jubilation by Gabriel:

> Τίς λαλήσει τὰς δυναστείας σου, Χριστέ, ἢ τίς ἐξαριθμήσει τὰ σὰ θαυμάσια; ὄντως, ἀδελφοί, ἀνεξερεύνητα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ· θαύματα γὰρ γέγονε πολλάκις, θείᾳ

δυνάμει τερατουργημένα· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ νῦν γεγονὸς ἐφ᾽ ἡμῖν τῶν μεγάλων ἐκείνων καὶ θαυμασίων τερατουργημάτων παραπλήσιόν ἐστι καί, εἰ τολμηρὸν εἰπεῖν, ἔχει τι καὶ πλέον·[2] [Who can express your sovereignty, O Christ, or who can number your wonders? Indeed, brothers, his judgements are unexplored and unexamined are his ways; for he performed miracles many times, made by divine power; but the current event near ourselves is close to those great and wondrous marvels and, I dare say, it somehow has the edge].

In the same encomium Gabriel expresses some elementary political theory. People are, he claimed, ruled by the rulers that they deserve. In this he includes secular and religious rulers, as well as subjugation to enemies. We may read into this remark a comment on the current situation. In support of his argument he paraphrases Jeremiah, saying that:

«δώσω ὑμῖν ἄρχοντα κατὰ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν», δῆλόν ἐστιν ἐντεῦθεν ὅτι οἱ μὲν ἀρχόντων καὶ βασιλέων, ὡς ἄξιοι τῆς τοιαύτης τιμῆς, προχειρίζονται ὑπὸ θεοῦ, ἔνθα ἐστὶν εὐνομίας ἄξιος ὁ λαός, οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἀνάξιοι √ντες πρὸς τὸν ἄξιον λαὸν τῆς αὐτῶν ἀναξιότητος κατὰ θεοῦ συγχώρησιν προχειρίζονται[3] [‘I will give you an archon according to your hearts’. This declares that those among the archons and kings who are worthy of such an honour, are put forward by God, because the people are worthy of good order. Those rulers who are unworthy, on the other hand, are given to those peoples who deserve their unworthiness by the will of God].

He also talks about the occupation of Thessalonica by the Turks between 1387 and 1403, draws attention to the care that St Demetrius took of his city while it was under the Turks and to his role in the city’s liberation. Once again under Christian rule, Thessalonica itself is likened to a jubilant Jerusalem that rejoices and dances:

Εὐφραίνου ἐν Κυρίῳ πόλις Θεσσαλονίκη, τοιοῦτον πλουτοῦσα φρουρὸν καὶ φύλακα καὶ μεσίτην πρὸς Χριστὸν ἀκαταίσχυντον· ἀγάλλου καὶ χόρευε ἐν κόλποις τοῦτον κατέχουσα ὡς θησαυρὸν· ἀπόλαυε τῆς ἀγλαΐας τῶν ἀρρήτων θαυμάτων τὴν πληθὺν καθορῶσα καὶ βλέπε καταράσσοντα τῶν βαρβάρων τὰ θράση καὶ εὐχαρίστως τῷ Σωτῆρι ἀνάκραξον (...)[4] [Rejoice in the Lord city Thessalonica, in having such riches in your guardian and protector and mediator with Christ, who cannot be put to shame; be glad and dance to have in your bosom such a treasure; enjoy the splendour of the ineffable miracles, behold [their] multitude,

and look at how the haughtiness of the barbarians be crushed, and gladly cry out to the Saviour (…)].

In another encomium, entitled '῾Ομιλία περὶ τοῦ μὴ προσέχειν τοῖς βιοτικοῖς πράγμασι καὶ εἰς τὸν μεγαλομάρτυρα Δημήτριον' [A speech on not paying attention to daily cares and to the great martyr Demetrius], Gabriel also speaks of the ἄνω ῾Ιερουσαλήμ[5] (Jerusalem on high[6]): 'Πόλις ἡμῶν ἐστι καὶ πατρὶς ἡ ἄνω ῾Ιερουσαλήμ' [Our City and homeland is the higher Jerusalem]. The idea of Jerusalem being our home above is a recognisable Christian theme and at the time that Gabriel expressed it, with the political situation being acutely severe, it was even more poignant.

Gabriel was, of course, being entirely uncontroversial in praising St Demetrius's role in the events leading up to the Ottoman defeat and its aftermath. It is highly unlikely that anyone in Thessalonica would have disagreed with him. Other encomiasts, however, sometimes make reference to internal, Byzantine politics and this was a very different matter because it was not something in which they could automatically expect the agreement of their audience. Take for example the reference in Palamas's encomium to the happy situation that he and other hesychast supporters found themselves after the victory of John Kantakouzenos in 1347:

> Πάντα λέλυται τὰ δεινά, πάντα προσεγένετο τὰ χρηστά, Δημητρίου τῆς εὐσεβείας προκινδινεύσαντος. Καὶ ναοὶ μὲν εὐμεγέθεις καὶ περικαλλεῖς καὶ μόνῃ τῇ θέᾳ πάντας πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἐπιστρέφοντες ἐπὶ τῶν καταδύσεων ἐκείνων ἑστήκασι, βασιλεῖς δὲ τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ μᾶλλον ἢ τῇ βασιλείᾳ κοσμούμενοι συμπαριστᾶσιν ἡμῖν καὶ συνεπικροτοῦσιν εὐφημοῦντες τὰς ἀριστείας τοῦ μάρτυρος· πᾶσα δὲ ἡ πόλις παρρησιαζόμεθα τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἐπὶ τῷ μαρτυρίῳ τοῦ μεγάλου Δημητρίου καυχώμενοι[7] [All the misfortunes have passed, all the good things have happened, because Demetrius endangered himself from the beginning. Spacious and attractive temples have been erected in the place of those underground, ones that attract everybody's attention purely by their spectacle; emperors that are decorated more by piety than by their office are supportive of us and join us in our praise, exalting the brave deeds of the martyr; and the whole of the city speak daringly of the piety of the great Demetrius and are proud of his martyrdom].

Palamas was treading carefully here because he must have realized that many of his hearers in Thessalonica would still have cherished deep animosity towards Kantakouzenos on both theological and political grounds given the city's bitter opposition to him during the civil war of 1341–7.

The remainder of this chapter will investigate other such contentious matters that are explored in the encomia. Two authors in particular will be discussed, Demetrius Chrysoloras and Symeon of Thessalonica along with their response to two pressing problems in the history of Thessalonica: the period under the rule of John VII (1403–8) and the threat of Turkish conquest during the 1420s.

Turning first to Chrysoloras, the early years of the fifteenth century found him in a delicate political situation. He had close ties of friendship with the Emperor Manuel II but at the same time he seems to have maintained very cordial relations with Manuel's nephew, and rival for the throne, John VII Palaiologos. Chrysoloras was well placed to appreciate the tense situation because between 1403 and 1408 he was resident in Thessalonica and serving as Mesazon or first minister of John VII during the latter's rule of the city. He describes himself as holding this post in the title of his satirical work Encomium to a flea: 'Δημητρίου τοῦ Χρυσολωρᾶ τοῦ μεσάζοντος ψύλλης ἐγκώμιον'.[8] That inevitably placed him in a difficult position if he was to keep the favour of both uncle and nephew, as is made clear in an anecdote told by the historian Sylvester Syropoulos. In around 1407 he was sent by John VII to Constantinople on unspecified business. At dinner with the emperor Manuel, which is also an indication of the familiarity between them, Chrysoloras was at pains to point out that he regarded Manuel's son John, later Emperor John VIII (1425–1448) as much his lord as his did Manuel's nephew, John VII.[9]

The tension can also be traced in an oration that was written by Chrysoloras at some point between 1403 and 1408 in praise of St Demetrius and the myrrh that exuded from his tomb. We have come across this encomium previously but now it will be examined from a different angle.[10] At first sight, this encomium looks very unpromising as a reflection of contemporary reality. Previous analyses of it have

completely ignored the possibility of its being so. Charalambos Bakirtzis focussed on the evidence it gives about the myrrh of the saint, its production, and its distribution to the faithful.[11] Laourdas, too, mentions how the archaeological evidence from work in the basilica of St Demetrius in Thessalonica coincides with the remarks made by Demetrius Chrysoloras in his work. Laourdas also compares the oration with pictorial evidence to match the detail that St Demetrius was killed by six soldiers in his cell. These scholars mention no reflection of contemporary events in late Byzantium. On the contrary, unflattering remarks have been passed on the literary merits of Chrysoloras's writing, both by Laourdas and Gautier who have called his work neither very abundant nor very important.[12] Incidentally, Demetrius Chrysoloras was a talented and prolific writer and his works deserve scholarly attention.

Chrysoloras's encomium reveals the climate in Thessalonica in the time he was writing and his classical mimesis and metaphor occasionally obscures a frank statement of his views. That is suggested by the following verbose but intriguing passage. Speaking about the restoration of Thessalonica to Byzantine rule in 1403, he declares St Demetrius to be the city's liberator and protector:

> ἐλευθερωτὴς μὲν αἰχμαλώτων ἀπείρων ἐξεγένετο φανερῶς, τῶν μὲν εἰς ἤπειρον ἡκόντων ἐκ τῆς ἠπείρου, τῶν δὲ καὶ διὰ θαλάσσης ἐλθόντων, καὶ τῶν μὲν ἐν αὐτῇ γε κινδυνευόντων, ἄλλων δὲ καὶ καταψηφιζομένων εἰς θάνατον καὶ ἀγνώστως διασωθέντων, καὶ ἄλλων ἄλλως ἄλλῃ περικειμένων ὀδύνῃ καὶ σωτηρίας ἐπιτυχόντων μόνον ἐπικαλουμένων πίστει τὸν ἅγιον· ἔτι παντοίων ἰατρὸς νοσημάτων, οὐ τῶν ἐν σώματι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν περὶ ψυχὴν ὄντων καὶ σχεδὸν ἀνιάτων· φρουρὸς μόνος ἀκριβὴς τῇ πόλει γέγονε ταύτη καὶ φύλαξ ἄϋπνος ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ πολλάκις αὐτὴν ἐρρύσατο, μόλις δὲ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν αὐτὴν ἐλέσθαι τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους παραχωρεῖ· πλὴν ἐπὶ βραχὺ τοῦτο, εἶτα κρειττόνως αὐτὴν ἐπανάγει, μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον, ἐν προσθήκῃ μὴ μόνον ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν χρημάτων, ἀλλὰ καὶ γενναίων κτισμάτων καὶ ὅτε πᾶν τὸ γένος διαπεφώνηκε καὶ τηρεῖ πάλιν αὐτὴν ὡς καὶ πρότερον.[13] [He became manifestly the liberator of innumerable captives, whether on land, for those who arrived from the land, or (at sea) for those who came by sea; of those who endangered their lives (in the sea), of others who were given up for dead and were saved mysteriously, and of others who suffered in some other way. They achieved safety only by proclaiming faith to the saint; thus he was the physician

> of many ailments, not only of the body, but also of those that weigh upon the soul and are almost incurable; he has become a lone and perfect guardian to this city and the sole sleepless guard. He delivered the city many times but for our wrongdoings he reluctantly chose to grant it to the foreigners; but only for a short time, and then mightily he brought it back, stronger than before, with the addition not only of men and of money, but also of lofty buildings and everything that our own country articulates as essential and he preserves the city again as before].

It is striking that the latter part of the passage suggests that after its restoration to Byzantine rule, Thessalonica was even stronger than it had been before. The praise for these positive developments after 1403 is ostensibly being given to St Demetrius. However, it must have been some more earthly individual who was responsible for the new buildings and the money that Chrysoloras mentions. That individual can only have been John VII who, as ruler of the city immediately after its restoration would have had the task of putting it in order. By contrast, Manuel II's rule in Thessalonica in the 1380s had ended in his humiliating withdrawal. In short, Chrysoloras was subliminally praising John but giving the glory to the saint. It was a sensible way of praising John without giving offence to Manuel in Constantinople.

Chrysoloras was by no means the only one to give John credit for his administration of Thessalonica and others were not so circumspect in their praise. The Synodikon of Thessalonica gives an account that commemorates the significance of St Demetrius in the city's deliverance and also openly praises John VII for coming to dwell amongst the citizens and for seeing to their every need. Its entry for John is longer than that for Manuel II.[14] John VII was noted for good works on Mount Athos during his reign in Thessalonica that he performed out of piety and for the benefit of his soul.[15] A later chronicle goes even further and attributes to John VII the characteristics of a saint:

> Ἔσχε δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς Ἀνδρόνικος υἱὸν ὀνόματι Ἰωάννην, ὃν καὶ καταλείψας ἐν τῇ Πόλει φυλάττειν αὐτὴν ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ θεῖος αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸς ἐπορεύθη ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ, ὅπως δώσωσιν αὐτὸν δύναμιν κατὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν καὶ ἴδωσι καὶ περὶ ἐνώσεως τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. Ἦν δὲ ὁ ἀνεψιὸς αὐτοῦ ἐν πᾶσιν ἐπιτηδειότατος καὶ εὐλαβὴς, ὅν καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐπανελθεῖν τὸν βασιλέα ἐξ Ἰταλίας ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τὴν Θεσσαλονίκην·

> ἦν γὰρ ἄκρος τὴν ἀρετὴν ὡς καὶ ὁ τάφος αὐτοῦ νῦν ἰᾶται ἀσθενείας παντοίας.[16] [And this Andronikos [IV] had a son called John, whom having left in the City to guard it, the emperor, his uncle went to Italy, in order for them to give him strength against the impious and to see about the union of the Churches. And his nephew was very skilled in everything, and god-fearing, so that after the homecoming of the emperor from Italy, he gave him Thessalonica. And he was extremely virtuous, so much that his tomb now therefore heals every kind of illness].

Chrysoloras could never have gone as far as that but in his very circumspection, he is eloquent on the divided loyalties that so many courtiers must have felt.

The second main author under consideration in this chapter is Symeon of Thessalonica. His second encomium touches on some of the events relating to John VII and his reign in Thessalonica but is much more informative for the later years especially the period of Venetian rule. That is because Symeon played an important role in the crucial events of the 1420s, giving his work an eyewitness quality. In 1417, a year after Symeon became metropolitan, the young Despot Andronikos, the third son of Manuel II, ceased to be under the tutelage of Demetrius Laskaris Leontaris and started to rule in Thessalonica in his own right. The fragile and ailing prince clearly found the burden of his office a heavy one, however, and as a result Symeon became more closely involved in developing a policy to defend the city than previous metropolitans had been. In 1422, he took it upon himself to set out for Constantinople to present Thessalonica's plight to the Emperor Manuel. He seems to have been strongly opposed to the Venetian takeover in 1423 but once they were installed, the Venetians attempted to cultivate the Metropolitan since they were clearly well aware of his influence.[17] Once the Venetians were in charge, Symeon advised obedience to them, as is recorded by John Anagnostes,[18] but the hand-over had anguished him greatly, and he had been passionately opposed to it, as can be seen from his account.

At the same time, Symeon seems to have been a conscientious pastor who did not lose sight of his spiritual duty in the midst of the crisis. He wrote a sympathetic and consoling letter to the despot when Andronikos withdrew from power and became a monk on the

submission of the city to the Venetians in 1423. In it, Symeon praised the young prince's choice to follow the monastic life:

> Χαῖρε, φιλόχριστε τῷ ὄντι καὶ εὐσεβέστατε δέσποτα. Οὐδὲ γὰρ χρὴ πρὸς τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης ἀπάρχεσθαι ἐν τοῖς σοῖς τὴν γὰρ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἀγαλλίασιν ἐπεπόθησας. (…) Σὺ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μιμητὴς τοῦ διὰ σὲ ταπεινοῦ. (…) Οὐκέτι γήινος εἶ, ἀλλὰ πολίτης τῶν ἄνω, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ τῶν ἄνω δεσπότου συμβασιλεύς τε καὶ σύναθλος. Καὶ τὸν ἄθλον γὰρ τούτου μιμῇ κατὰ δύναμιν, τὸ μὲν τὰ τῶν πειρασμῶν ὑποφέρων, τὸ δὲ καὶ ταῖς τοῦ σώματος ἀλγηδόσι καὶ ταις ὀδύναις τῶν μελῶν συμπάσχων αὐτῷ[19] [Hail, lover of Christ, truly, and most pious master. It is not needed to commence from a position of sorrow in yourself; for you have desired the joy of the angels. (…) You (are) an imitator of Jesus, for being humble. (…) For you are not earthly, but a citizen of above, and rather a joint king and fellow athlete of the master of heaven. And do imitate his achievement to the end of your capability, on the one hand by enduring the temptations that he suffered, and on the other hand by suffering with him in the pains of the body and the afflictions of all of the body's members].

This advisory letter to Andronikos shows the closeness between the two men. Despite recognising that Andronikos had very little choice other than surrender the city, Symeon was very displeased with the situation. The Venetian years found Symeon all the more determined to promote the interests of Orthodoxy. It must be noted here that he did not see submission to the Ottomans as serving such interests: he advised resistance to death. The debate about the future of the city was a passionate one and Symeon expressed his resolute and unwavering position through his many ecclesiastical works. The second encomium to St Demetrius is central in the context of this debate.

Unlike the case of Demetrius Chrysoloras, reflection of the contemporary situation in Symeon's two encomia is in no way hidden or subliminal. The theme of the ever-growing threat to Thessalonica runs throughout them both. Symeon is, however, extremely creative in the way that he discusses that theme. For example, he links Thessalonica to Constantinople in an unexpected way. The link is their transgressions. He sees the bad state of morality in both cities as being punishable by God: 'Τοῖς τοιούτοις οὖν καὶ ἡ πόλις αὕτη συνέπασχεν ὡς κοινωνοῦσα τῇ πρώτῃ τοῖς ἀξίοις τῶν πειρασμῶν'[20] [And in these things this city has been suffering

together with the first city, having partaken in its fair share of temptations]. The presence of the Venetians was seen as a result of such transgressions.

Symeon also injects a personal element into his work, one that is not found to a similar degree in the other encomia. In a dejected tone he calls himself an unfortunate shepherd, 'ἄθλιον ποιμένα'[21], and he contrasts his life in previous years, which he led uneventfully and peacefully, 'ἀπραγμόνως καὶ εἰρηνικῶς',[22] with the time when 'ὑπὲρ δύναμίν τε σχεδὸν πειρώμενον καταστέλλειν τὰς ταραχὰς καὶ τὰ παρὰ λόγον γινόμενα καὶ μηδαμῶς ἐξισχύοντα'[23] [almost above my strength I attempted to subdue the agitations and the irrational things that were taking place but hardly succeeding at all]. He regards his sufferings as so great that they made him like a corpse: 'οὐδὲν διαφέρων ἤμην νεκροῦ, τῇ κλίνῃ προσηλωμένος ὡς ἀπαγορεύσας[24] τῇ λύπῃ καὶ τῇ συνεχείᾳ τῶν θλίψεων'[25] [not being different to someone who is dead, bedridden, having fallen short through sorrow and the continuity of afflictions]. His worry was such that despite his frailty and through many physical dangers, he attempted a trip to see the emperor: 'ὥστε εἰ δυνηθείην, πρᾶξαί τι τῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, εἰς τὸν βασιλέα τὸν μέγαν Μανουὴλ πορευθείς'[26] [so that if I am able, I may perform a deed in favour of the city, I went to the emperor, the great Manuel]. The display of such self-pity shows the extent of his despair. Indeed, when instructing their congregation, it would be normally more likely for a pastoral leader to conceal rather than accentuate their own despondency and this sense of being broken and crushed by the violent force of circumstances. Symeon is not at all hesitant to reveal his state of being to his people.

Helplessness is another recurring theme in Symeon's speech and he indicates that he was not the only one who felt that way. It is made clear that the Despot Andronikos was also left to deal with the enormous problems in Thessalonica on his own and without much help from anyone, the emperors Manuel II and his son John VIII included: 'Καὶ ὁ μὲν τὴν πόλιν κρατῶν εὐσεβὴς δεσπότης ἐκλονεῖτο πάντοθεν καὶ πάσχων παρ᾽ οὐδενὸς εἶχε τὸ βοηθεῖσθαι, τὸ μὲν τῶν βασιλέων, τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ἰδίαν ἐχόντων τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς βασιλίδος μέριμναν'[27]

[And the pious despot who held the city was shaken from every side, and during his suffering he had no-one to help him, while the emperors, the father and the brother, had their own concern regarding the reigning city]. Andronikos was forced to write to his father to ask for help, and Symeon wrote in his support:

> Ἀποστέλλει μὲν πρέσβεις εἰς τὸν πατέρα καὶ βασιλέα ὁ κρατῶν τῆς πόλεως ταύτης δεσπότης, κἀγὼ δὲ διὰ τῶν ἡμετέρων τινὸς γράμμασιν ἀναγγέλλω τὰ περὶ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ὡς ἐν χρῷ κινδύνου ἡμεῖς καὶ ὡς, εἰ μὴ ἐκπέμψει πρὸς τε φυλακὴν καὶ πρᾶξιν ἁρμοδίους καὶ τῇ περιουσίᾳ ἰσχύοντας βοηθεῖν, εἰς προφανῆ κίνδυνον τὰ τῆς πόλεως. Καὶ τοῦτο οὐ τότε μόνον, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ γέγονεν.[28] [And he, the holder of the city and its despot, sends ambassadors to his father and emperor, and I also declare through my own letters the matters relevant to the city, and that by necessity we were at risk, and that if he does not send for our guard and business people who are authorised and strong in property and who can help with money, the affairs of the city are in obvious danger. Not only on this occasion but many times was this kind of thing done by me].

The picture painted here for Thessalonica is one of stark abandonment, with the resources of the empire clearly not being made available for its defence. If Constantinople and Thessalonica were so tied in the same fate, why did the Emperor and his heir, John VIII, abandon Andronikos to his fate? Further, Symeon mentions a Byzantine general who came to Thessalonica with the suggestion that the city should be defended through a common fund, drawn by a public collection of money. This general entered into negotiations with the enemy on his own initiative, which caused further agitation and disquiet in the city. This is the point when it all got too much for Andronikos and he started contemplating taking his leave: ‘Ὃ καὶ τὸν δεσπότην παρέπεισε πλέον ἐξελθεῖν καὶ ἑτέροις παραδοῦναι τὴν πόλιν· οὐδὲ γὰρ θαρρεῖν εἶχε τῶν ὅλων τινί’[29] [And that forced the despot to be persuaded to depart and to surrender the city to others; for he had no trust in any of them]. Here then, an encomium was being used to make frank criticism of the emperors, Manuel II and his son John VIII.

It was not sovereignty alone that concerned the archbishop of Thessalonica. Indeed, he was committed to the emperor. But at the

same time, it was the integrity of the Church that was almost more important. When the Venetians gained power, the preservation of Orthodoxy was his goal. So Symeon looked on in horror when the Venetians asked to be commemorated in the Orthodox liturgy: 'Τὰ προειρημένα οἴδατε πάντες, περὶ τε φήμης καὶ μνημοσύνου ζητήσεως καὶ ναῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις τοὺς ἐκείνων ἐθέλειν ἱερουργεῖν'[30] [You all know what I just said, and also regarding their request to be proclaimed and commemorated (in the liturgy) and their request for churches, and that they want to celebrate Mass in our churches]. Symeon refers to the ecclesiastical situation in the islands and in Cyprus, which were also under Latin rule, as something deplorable and to be avoided at all costs.[31] The thought of allowing the Catholic priests to participate in the rites in any way or to be commemorated appears to him to be a major compromise on the doctrine and Orthodox life of the Byzantine Church. The fact that such examples were to be found in other parts of the Greek lands made such a possibility more likely in his eyes and filled him with anxiety and horror.

Looking at the same topic more broadly, Symeon was pessimistic about the survival of the Church without the protection of the Byzantine Empire. In another work he paints a bleak picture of any chances of survival of the Church under the Turks, which is the reason he gives for fighting to the very end. In support of his rationale he draws attention to what happened to other churches that were then not in Byzantine hands any more. The ancient Christian cities of Alexandria, Jerusalem and Antioch become part of his analysis:

> Οὐ τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐταπεινοῦτο, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ Ἀντιοχείᾳ καὶ τόποις ἄλλοις; Πόσοι νῦν ἐκεῖσε χριστιανοί, πόσοι τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ ἱερέων καὶ μοναζόντων; Οὐκ ὀλιγοστοὶ λίαν καὶ ἀτιμαζόμενοι παρὰ τῶν ἀθέων; Ἴδωμεν δὲ καὶ τὰς τῆς ἀνατολῆς πάσας πόλεις, οἵαι γεγόνασι διεφθαρμέναι καὶ παρὰ χριστιανῶν αἱ πλείους ἀοίκητοι· καὶ ὅπου τινὲς χριστιανοί, μυκτηριζόμενοι, περιφρονούμενοι τε καθ' ἡμέραν καὶ ὀλιγοστοὶ γινόμενοι. [32] [And have not the concerns of the Church been humiliated, as also in Egypt, and Jerusalem, and Antioch, and other places? How many are the Christians there, and how many of the archbishops, the priests, and the ones who lead the monastic life? Are they not very few indeed, and dishonoured by

> the atheists? And we have seen all the cities of the East, how they have become corrupt and mostly devoid of Christian inhabitants; and wherever in them there are some Christians, they are mocked, and ignored every day, and become fewer in numbers].

Late Byzantine chroniclers confirm Symeon's fears when recording some of the things that happened to the city of Thessalonica after the fall. Doukas mentions laconically and sorrowfully how after the fall of the city churches were abandoned: ἐρημώθησαν ναοί [temples were relinquished].[33] In more detail, and in theological language that is reminiscent of Symeon, Anagnostes accounts how the communion tables in the churches were treated by the conquering army:

> καὶ τὰς θείας τραπέζας, ἐφ᾽ αἷς ἡ θεία μυστικὴ καὶ ζῶσα καὶ σωστικὴ παντὸς ἐπετελεῖτο τοῦ κόσμου θυσία, τῇ τῶν χρημάτων ἐπιθυμίᾳ κατὰ σπουδὴν ἀνατρέπειν καὶ καταπάτημα φεῦ τοῖς βουλομένοις τιθέναι.[34] [and the holy tables, on which the holy, mystical, and living, and all-saving sacrifice of the world took place, for the desire of money with haste they overturn, and alas they trample all over anyone].

What is more, Anagnostes shows not only how the physical remains faded, and the clergy left, but also how things were slowly eradicated from the collective memory: 'καὶ μονουχὶ τῶν γηραιοτέρων ἔξεστιν ἀκούειν ἀνδρῶν ὡς ὧδε μὲν ἦν ὁ νεὼς ὁ δεῖνα ἐκεῖ δὲ ὁ δεινα, καὶ ὅσα προσῆν ἑκάστῳ καὶ κάλλη καὶ χάριτες'.[35] [and only from the older men it was possible to hear (saying) that here was this church, and there was that church, and all the beauties and graces that were attached to each].

In the mind of Anagnostes, as in the mind of Symeon, the freedom to celebrate the religious festivals and to talk about the faith is indistinguishable from civic freedom:

> ὢ πῶς ὁ τῆς εὐημερίας ἡμῖν καιρὸς ἐπιθέσεως καὶ καταδρομῆς γέγονε, καὶ καταλειφθέντες αἰσχύνη καὶ ὄνειδος γεγενήμεθα. οἴχονται πανηγύρεις, οἴχονται θείων ἐκτυπωμάτων λαμπρότητες. ἀπόλωλε παρρησία. τὸ τῶν μοναχῶν ἀπελήλαται τάγμα, καὶ πολιαὶ πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων σεμνότης ἐν τοῖς ἀτίμοις λογίζονται.[36] [O how the time of prosperity has become one of attack and raid, and we who are left have become a shame and a reproach. Absent are the festivals, absent are the displays of divine figures. Lost is the courage of speech (about the faith).

> The order of the monks has been lost, and the guards of the priests and solemnity of the deacons are regarded as things dishonourable].

In his frank expression of his ecclesiastical and political agenda, Symeon was most unlike Nicholas Kavasilas, even though both authors were prepared to be open in the articulation of their deep feelings. Kavasilas's work was for him a personal journey and his opinions matured, developed, and wavered throughout his life, as he agonisingly tried different paths and lines of argument in order to give his thought expression in a manner that would satisfy his inquiring spirit. Symeon by contrast seems to have considered consistency and steadfastness in what he saw as the core beliefs of the Church as a most important and necessary attribute. Therefore Symeon was adamantly opposed to any compromise in ecclesiastical life, even if it would bring material benefits and could increase the level of comfort experienced in the city. Such efforts for improving things in Thessalonica were made anyway and the wish for compromises within the Church does not appear to have been a condition but only a separate aspect of the time of the Venetians there. Although Symeon recognises the Venetians' efforts to make peace and their material contributions of ships and food, however, Thessalonica still suffered conditions of hunger. He intimates that many of its inhabitants abandoned their homes and surrendered themselves to the enemy or lived in other people's lands, or became captive. As for the ones who remained, they were so afflicted by hunger that 'τὸν τοῦ θανάτου φόβον πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν κεκτημένων ἔσωθέν τε καὶ ἔξωθεν'[37] [they had the fear of death before their eyes, from within and outside]. More citizens were therefore forced to give themselves over to the enemy: 'ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν αὐτομόλους παρεῖχον, καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἡμῶν γνωστὰ γέγονε τοῖς ἐχθροῖς'[38] [they gave themselves over to the impious by their own accord, and they made the nature of our needs known to the enemies]. The fact that the Turks knew the extent of the suffering within the walls acted as a psychological boost for them and a blow for the besieged Byzantines.

Yet Symeon did not trust the Venetians to be benevolent towards the Church in the long term. He took a very uncompromising stance on this matter, expressing animosity against both the Latins and

the Turks but possibly reserving the stronger antipathy for the West, most probably the Venetians for their involvement in Thessalonica:

> Καὶ τὰς ἐν τῇ δύσει δὲ βλέπομεν κατὰ μικρὸν ἀφανιζομένας πόλεις. Διωγμὸς γὰρ ὑπάρχει, καὶ τὸ ἀσεβὲς τοῦτο ἔθνος πρόδρομον ἀληθῶς τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου ἐστὶ καὶ τὸν ὄφιν ἐκεῖνον ἐκμιμεῖται τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἐξαπατήσαντα. Φιλίαν μὲν ὑποκρίνεται καὶ τρυφὴν ἐπαγγέλεται καὶ ἐλευθερίαν ψευδῶς· καταδουλοῖ δέ, θανατοῖ καὶ παντελῶς διαφθείρει καὶ τέλος εἰς Θεὸν ποιεῖ βλασφημεῖν.[39] [And we see the cities in the West, how they are reduced to exhaustion. For there is persecution, and this impious nation, is truly the forerunner of the Antichrist, and it imitates that snake who deceived Adam. It pretends friendship and promises luxury and freedom falsely; for it enslaves, it kills and corrupts totally, and moreover, it brings about blasphemy to God].

How would he have taken the Venetians' intention as recorded by Doukas, to rework Thessalonica into their own image: 'εἰς δευτέραν Βενετίαν μετασχηματίσαι' [to transform into a second Venice]![40]

In his plea to the citizens to stand firm for the sake of Christ, Symeon expresses a soundly established view in late Byzantium that the city of Thessalonica, with its increased autonomy, prominence and distinction, was a vital counterpart of Constantinople for the custody and preservation of the faith.

> Διὰ τοῦτο στῶμεν γενναίως ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ἡ πόλις αὕτη κεφάλαιον τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ἐστι μετὰ τὴν πρώτην καὶ βασιλίδα[41] [For this let us stand bravely in favour of Christ. For this city has been a centre of piety from the beginning, together with the first city and capital].

Or even more strongly expressed by him elsewhere:

> Πλὴν ἔτι διὰ τὸ ὀρθὸν τῆς ὁμολογίας μόνον ἡμῶν συνέχει ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος καὶ ἀρχιερωσύνης χάριν ἡμῖν συντηρεῖ καὶ βασιλείαν εὐσεβῆ, τῆς ὀρθῆς ἕνεκα μόνης πίστεως ἐξ ἡμῶν ἔτι ἐκδεχόμενος καί τινα καρπόν. Οὐ γὰρ μόνη ἡ πίστις σῴζει, ὡς παρὰ τοῦ Θεαδέλφου μανθάνομεν λέγοντος, ὅτι «ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἐστι». Ὅθεν καὶ οἱ δύο ἐξαίρετοι πόλεις αὗται μετὰ μικρῶν ἑτέρων, ἡ Κωνσταντίνου φημὶ καὶ Θεσσαλονίκη, ἐναπελείφθησαν ἡμῖν εἰς φυλακὴν εὐσεβείας καὶ ἄχρι τοῦ παρόντος χάριτι Θεοῦ συντηροῦνται.[42] [And apart from everything else, it is only for the correctness

> of the confession of the faith that the Lord sustains us, and for the sake of the archbishopric he keeps us and our pious kingship, accepting from us the correct and only faith and its fruit. But faith alone does not save, as we learn from the Brother of the Lord (James), who said that 'the faith without works is dead'. From that cause it is that both of those excellent cities with some other small ones, the one of Constantine, I say, and Thessalonica, have been left to us in custody of piety and up to this present have been protected by the grace of God].

Doukas echoes this view in his account, when talking about the fall of Thessalonica in 1430, as he marks it as the sign of a doomed future for the Byzantine capital: 'ἀπαρχὴ κακὴ καὶ ἀπαίσιος τῶν μελλόντων κακῶν ἐν τῇ βασιλευούσῃ.' [a poor first-fruit and ominous of future evils in the Queen of Cities].[43]

Symeon links the fates of Thessalonica and Constantinople as if they both form part of the same greater scheme of things. This greater scheme is Christianity. He identifies as the reason for their salvation the faith, and as the reason for their previous temporary loss the lack of pious works, and the lack of desire for the Christian life. In lamenting the lack of such a desire, Symeon crystallizes the two main Christian ideals, namely peace and love:

> ὅτιπερ ἐξ ἡμῶν τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ χριστιανῶν καλουμένων ἐξέλιπε πᾶν χρηστὸν καὶ μᾶλλον ἡ εἰρήνη καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀγάπης καλόν καὶ πλέον ἔτι ὁ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ζῆλος καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ[44] [that exactly from us who are in name pious and Christian, there has been lacking everything good and especially the peace and the quality of love and furthermore zeal for Christ and the things that spring from it].

He notes that in his day within the body of Christ, which is the Church, no one is willing to endure the many sorrows of the first Christians: 'οὐδ' ὑπομεῖναι κακοπάθειαν ἢ θλῖψιν σαρκός τινα ὡς οἱ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀληθεῖς καὶ ὄντως χριστιανοί'[45] [and we would not endure discomfort or sorrow of the body, as did the first and true, and truly Christian]. But even more than their failure to excel like these, Symeon deplores how a life indifferent to religion appeals to them:

> Καὶ τὸ χείριστον, ὡς διὰ ταύτην τὴν τοῦ λυομένου σώματος καὶ θνήσκοντος ἄνεσιν, ὕβριν δὲ μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν καὶ φθοράν, τοὺς ἐθνικούς, τοὺς ἀθέους, τοὺς μιαρούς, ὢ τῆς ἀπονοίας, πλεῖστοι ἀνόητοι μακαρίζουσι καὶ ἐρασταὶ τούτων εἰσὶ τῆς ἀκαθάρτου ζωῆς.[46] [And the worst thing is that for this comfort of the dissolving and mortal body, they would rather commit hubris and decay. The great fools – O the heartlessness! – praise the pagans, the atheists, the defiled and are lovers of their unclean life].

No wonder, then, that such troubles befell his people: ‘Διὰ τοῦτο ὠλιγώθημεν παρὰ πάντας καὶ ἐσμὲν οἱ ἀθλιώτεροι σήμερον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς διὰ τὰς ἀθέσμους ἡμῶν πράξεις καὶ ἁμαρτίας ταύτας καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πλημμελήματα’[47] [For this (reason) we have been reduced by everyone and we are the most deplorable, today, on earth for our lawless actions and for these sins and for our other wrongdoings]. At this point he lays bare the core of his argument. This resumes his previous points and puts them more strongly. Firstly that it is only by the confession of the faith that Byzantium survived so far. And secondly that salvation does not come by faith alone, but accompanying deeds are necessary if the empire is to be preserved by God. Temporary loss of freedom is portrayed as an instruction for the lukewarm Christians. In the deliverance of his people, St Demetrius is therefore likened to Moses. In being described as all powerful, at this point St Demetrius is likened to the Virgin Mary in the way he protects his city:

> Καὶ ἡ μὲν ὅλως τοῖς ἐχθροῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ οὐχ ὑπέκυψε, περισῳζούσης αὐτὴν τῆς πάντων βασιλίδος ἀειπαρθένου τῆς Θεομήτορος· ἡ δὲ πρὸς ὀλίγον ὑπαχθεῖσα δουλείᾳ πρὸς παιδείαν ἅμα καὶ δοκιμὴν ἔκτισίν τε, ὥνπερ ἡμάρτομεν, πάλιν θερμαῖς ἱκεσίαις τοῦ μεγάλου φύλακος αὐτῆς Δημητρίου τὴν δουλείαν ἀπέρριψε, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἐκφυγοῦσα τῶν τυρρανούντων, ἐλεύθερον φῶς εἶδε καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἐπαρρησιάσατο. Καὶ θαῦμα ἐπὶ τούτῳ γέγονε μέγιστον. Ὡς γὰρ πρὶν τοὺς Ἰσραηλίτας διὰ Μωϋσέως Θεός καὶ διὰ Δημητρίου τὴν πόλιν ταύτην ἐρρύσατο.[48] [And, on the one hand, she did not wholly give into the enemies of Christ, being saved by the Queen of all, the ever-virginal Mother of God; while on the other, having for a little while been subjected to slavery for (our) discipline and testing, and getting through it, for it was we who sinned, again with the warm pleading of its great guardian Demetrius, she rejected slavery, and with the hands escaping the tyrants, she saw the light of freedom

and she spoke freely about the faith. And on this respect a most remarkable miracle took place. Exactly as before God led the Israelites with Moses, he delivered this city through Demetrius].

There were troubled discussions amongst the citizens about what to do regarding the defence or surrender of Thessalonica. That is apparent from the talks of sending messengers to Murad, alluded to in documents of the Venetian Senate.[49] Symeon asks for self-sacrifice and for fighting the attacker to death: '῞Απαντες οὖν ὑμεῖς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ μένετε γνώμῃ καὶ ἑτοίμως ἔχετε, παρακαλῶ, καιροῦ καλοῦντος, εἰ δυνατόν, ἐκχέαι καὶ τὸ αἷμα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμῶν εὐσεβείας καὶ τοῦ μὴ καταδουλωθῆναι τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν ἐχθροῖς'[50] [All of you, please remain of the same opinion and be ready, as the circumstance may be calling for it, if possible to let your blood run for our faith and not to be enslaved by our irreligious enemies].

It was a prevalent opinion in Byzantium that calamity was symptomatic of sin, and Symeon expresses this view in another aspect of public life, the relationship between the Church and the emperor. This had also deteriorated, Symeon warned, and that was displeasing to God. He expands on this in two paragraphs about ecclesiastical affairs entitled '῞Οτι οὐ τιμᾶται νῦν ἡ ἀρχιερωσύνη παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων ὡς πρότερον· διὰ τοῦτο ὀργίζεται Θεός' [That the position of the archbishop is not honoured by the kings as before; and for that God is angered] and '῞Οτι τὸ ἀσπάζεσθαι ἀρχιερεῖς τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως χεῖρα παρὰ τὴν κανονικὴν τάξιν· καὶ τὸ μεταθέσεις ἐπισκόπων καὶ ἡγουμένων ποιεῖν τὸν βασιλέα'[51] [That for the archbishops to kiss the hand of the king is beyond the proper order; and to have the king move posts of bishops and abbots]. In those passages Symeon expands with passion and anger on the humiliations of the archbishop and shows how the new shift in the relationship between the archbishop and the emperor is degrading for the Church.

The agony that Symeon felt and the climate in the city urged him to be expansive in his second encomium on the conditions within the walls and the low morale amongst his people. But the great volume of

material on the events in Thessalonica to be found in this encomium must not let us forget that this was a speech dedicated to St Demetrius. This is no dilution of the purpose of the speech. On the contrary, the fact that he does this shows how the encomia to St Demetrius acted as a platform for the pressing issues of the time to be addressed. Not that the saint was ever absent from the action. His heroic profile would not have allowed that. Indeed, he features prominently, and the blockade of 1426, for example, is described by Symeon in the framework of the saint's divine intervention.[52] He is also credited with emergency food supplies and rescuing the citizens from difficult situations. Moreover, he is put forward as an example for all to follow, having died for his faith. In those times of confusion and crisis, this is ultimately what Symeon asked of his flock.[53] Chrysoloras and Symeon thus provide strongly contrasting examples of how a strict genre could be adapted to contemporary conditions. The message could be inserted obliquely or made central to the encomium. In both cases, this literary form is at the very heart of events and of the contemporary reaction to them.

Aftermath

Following the second Ottoman conquest of Thessalonica in March 1430, the cult of St Demetrius was inevitably disrupted. According to Anagnostes, the victorious Turkish soldiers looted the saint's tomb. They took the gold, silver, precious stones and pearls that adorned it and tried to stem the flow of the miraculous myrrh.[1] After a few days, however, Sultan Murad II restored order and it would seem that the basilica of St Demetrius was left in the hands of the Christians for the time being. When the Italian humanist Cyriac of Ancona visited the following year, he found that it was still functioning as the centre of Demetrius's cult.[2] Only in 1492 was the basilica converted into a mosque. This event has been linked by scholars to the fall of Granada.[3]

In other respects, however, Christian worship in Thessalonica suffered from the change of ruler. The Acheiropoietos church was not as fortunate as the basilica and was immediately turned into a mosque. This did, however, ensure that the building benefited from a repair organised by the Ottoman governor of the city and costing 30,000 silver coins.[4] The Acheiropoietos was the landmark in the centre of the city that Murad chose to state his victory and that explains its immediate turn into a mosque. There is an inscription in the Acheiropoietos, which survives today, relating to the fall of Thessalonica. Translated into English it would read: 'The Sultan Murad Khan conquered the city of Thessalonica in 833 (=1430)'.[5] The Burgundian knight, Bertrandon de la Broquière noted when he visited the region in the 1430s that many Christians in Thessalonica had converted to Islam.[6]

With the two main churches of the Demetrius cult lost to Christian worship, Thessalonica inevitably lost its position as a centre of pilgrimage. The miraculous myrrh that had been so central to the cult is no longer attested after the fifteenth century.[7] Instead, Thessalonica became a Turkish and a cosmopolitan city. The

seventeenth century Turkish historian Hadji Khalfa called it 'a little piece of Istanbul'. Machiel Kiel's study sees Thessalonica as a city that, after undergoing a difficult re-birth, had become prominent in being 'a focus of Turkish-Islamic culture and Jewish spiritual life'. [8] Yet, Christian life continued in the city. Although there was no Metropolitan at the time of the Ottoman conquest, due to the death of Symeon, Gregorios was appointed in about 1432 and during the first half of 1439 a Metropolitan called Methodios appeared on the scene. He was probably Metropolitan until 1467.[9] The festival seems to have continued although its focus was increasingly commercial and a useful source of tax revenue for the Ottoman authorities.[10] Certainly, in December 1453, the Metropolitan of Thessalonica wrote to Nicholas Isidoros, a Greek judge in Ottoman service, to reassure him that even though the Festival of St Demetrius had been celebrated on the day after 26 October, it was done so with all due solemnity.[11] This is another indication that the cult of St Demetrius continued under Ottoman rule for the time being. The letter itself is part of a small collection of letters written soon after the end of Byzantium and is of considerable linguistic and cultural interest.

Just as the cult of St Demetrius waned in Thessalonica, so did the literary culture that had produced the encomia. Many educated Byzantines left the city after 1430. It is well-known that the Thessalonian Theodore Gazes (c.1400–1475/6) had a successful career in Italy after he left his home town while his lesser-known associate Andronikos Kallistos (c.1400–1476) went to Italy initially and then moved on to Paris and London.[12] This was the next generation that would have written the encomia for their own times. Some intellectuals did remain in Thessalonica. We know that the Constantinopolitan Luke Spandounes (d. 1481) taught Greek there and some time before 1494 the Greek Thessalonians asked for the pupil of George Gemistos Plethon, John Moschos, to be sent to them from Corfu to teach. The presence of the scholars Matthew Laskaris, Manuel Laskaris and Demetrius Sgouropoulos is recorded in the city, in the context of selling Greek manuscripts to Janus Laskaris (1445–1535). Janus took two trips in the Greek lands between 1489–92 to find more Greek works to assist with his studies and his career in Italy.[13] In spite of this, however, the milieu in which

Palamas, Harmenopoulos and Metropolitan Symeon had produced their encomia was gone.

Thessalonica remained under Ottoman rule until 1912, when it was taken by the Greeks a few days after a victorious battle at Yiannitsa during the Balkan Wars, which notably coincided with the feast day of St Demetrius, 26 October. As a result the cult of the saint enjoyed something of a revival. St Demetrius is today a major saint in the Eastern Church and once more the patron saint of the modern city of Thessaloniki. He still plays a role in the life of the city. A commercial fair still bears his name and, combined with that, every October the Greek prime minister goes up to Thessaloniki to give a speech of high political importance about the annual budget. St Demetrius appears extensively in the official literature of the municipality of Thessaloniki and he features in a mosaic in the main hall of the University, alongside Alexander the Great.

Nevertheless, the fervency and intensity of the cult as it was in late Byzantine times can never be recaptured. Thus to conclude, it would seem that the late Byzantine encomia to St Demetrius were the product of a moment in time. They encapsulated certain distinct ingredients. Some were centuries old: Thessalonian devotion to St Demetrius, the classical tradition, the Bible and the Greek Church Fathers, the values and ideology of the Byzantine state. Others, such as hesychasm and the anxieties provoked by the Ottoman threat, were more recent. This work has attempted therefore to demonstrate that the encomia were not simply stilted regurgitations of classical or religious models but a distinct voice of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

In discussing the cult of St Demetrius, this book is also inevitably a history of Thessalonica. Many readers may already have read Mark Mazower's celebrated account, *Salonica, City of Ghosts* (London, 2004). Mark Mazower starts his book where I finish (1430).

Appendix
Responses to the Fall of Thessalonica in 1430 by John Anagnostes in his Narration and Monody

This essay will examine through juxtaposition and comparison the two texts by John Anagnostes that refer to the siege and fall of Thessalonica. Both pieces are highly personal in their resonance and insights, and have the warmth and intensity of an eye-witness chronicle. The first text, his Narration, is more descriptive and linear, with some structure around the events that led to the devastation of his home town, but interspersed with powerful allusions to the climate of fear and despair in the city. The second, his Monody, is a poetical rendering of the fall by way of a lament, in which personal sentiment and the inner state of the author and the people around him take the lead.

The events described by Anagnostes took place during the last years of the Byzantine Empire. Thessalonica was the empire's second city but by about 1420 it was isolated in territory that had been conquered by the Ottoman Turkish Sultan, Murad II. In a desperate bid to save themselves, the people of the city handed it over to the Italian maritime republic of Venice, in the hope that the Venetian naval power would keep the Turks at bay. It was to no avail and on 29 March 1430 Murad II attacked and captured Thessalonica.

The emotional closeness and intimacy in the writing of Anagnostes will become apparent when compared to the tone of the other sources. The important event of the fall of Byzantine Thessalonica to the Ottomans in 1430 is recorded fairly briefly in the Histories of Laonikos Chalkokondyles, Doukas, and Sphrantzes.[1] These authors give accounts that are, in comparison, emotionally distant from the event they are describing, and they retain an air of clarity and neutrality in their portrayal. In all authors, including Anagnostes, there is reference to the Venetians and their role in the events, and some

estimation of their impact to the fall. A mention in Doukas is particularly striking, as he recounts that the Venetians when they took over Thessalonica undertook 'εἰς δευτέραν Βενετίαν μετασχηματίσαι'[2] [to transform into a second Venice]. Such a possibility, and the expression of such ambition, underlines the strategic and privileged location that Thessalonica enjoyed, and its potential as a major centre in the eastern Mediterranean. This makes the depopulation and depression in the city that resulted from the fall all the more sobering a sight.

Sinan Pasha, Vizier of Murad II, in a letter[3] to the metropolitan of Ioannina and the nobles asks them to surrender on the evidence of what happened to Thessalonica for resisting. This also gives us an insight into the major role the Italians played in Greece at the time. In the letter they are portrayed as responsible for the fall of Thessalonica: 'Διὰ τοῦτο γράφω σας καὶ λέγω, ὅτι νὰ προσκυνήσετε μὲ τὸ καλὸν καὶ μηδὲν πλανηθῆτε εἰς τῶν Φράγκων τὰ λόγια, ὅτι τίποτε δὲν σας θέλουν ὠφελήσει, πλὴν θέλουν σας χαλάσει, καθὼς ἐχάλασαν καὶ τοὺς Θεσσαλονικαίους'[4] [For this I write to you and say, to prostrate yourselves (meaning surrender) willingly, and not to be lured into the promises of the Franks, because they will benefit you in nothing, except they will destroy you, as they destroyed the Thessalonians]. The letter gives us a good idea of what took place after defeating a city, as it uses examples of previous devastations as threats. It also shows how important the ecclesiastical rights were to a community, and that a religious leader of a subjugated people also resolved disputes in the community, so acting as a judge:

> (…) ὅτι νὰ μηδὲν ἔχετε κανέναν φόβον, μήτε αἰχμαλωτισμὸν, μήτε πιασμὸν παιδίων, μήτε ἐκκλησίας νὰ χαλάσωμεν, μήτε μασγίδι νὰ ποιήσωμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ ἐκκλησίαις σας νὰ σημαίνουν, καθὼς ἔχουν συνήθειαν. Ὁ μητροπολίτης νὰ ἔχῃ τὴν κρίσιν του τὴν ῥωμαϊκὴν καὶ ὅλα του τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ δικαιώματα. Οἱ ἄρχοντες ὅσοι ἔχουν τιμάρια πάλιν νὰ τὰ ἔχουσι· τὰ γονικά τους, τὰ ὑποστατικά τους καὶ τὰ πράγματά τους ὅλα νὰ τὰ ἔχουν χωρὶς τινὸς λόγου. Καὶ ἄλλα εἴ τι ζητήματα θέλετε ζητήσει νὰ σᾶς τὰ δώσωμεν. Εἰ δὲ καὶ σταθῆτε πεισματικοὶ καὶ δὲν προσκυνήσετε μὲ τὸ καλὸν, νὰ ἠξεύρετε, ὅτι, ὥςπερ ἐδιαγουμίσαμεν τὴν Θεσσαλονίκην καὶ ἐχαλάσαμεν ταῖς

ἐκκλησίαις, καὶ ἐρημώσαμεν καὶ ἀφανίσαμεν τὰ πάντα, οὕτως θέλομεν χαλάσει καὶ ἐσᾶς καὶ τὰ πράγματά σας, καὶ τὸ κρῖμα νὰ τὸ γυρέψῃ ὁ θεὸς ἀπ᾽ ἐσᾶς.[5] [that neither to have any fear, nor captivity, nor bondage of children, nor will we destroy churches, nor will we make mosques, but also your churches will ring their bells as they do by custom. The metropolitan to have his Roman judgment and all his ecclesiastical rights. The archons, those who have *timaria*, to still have them; their inheritance, their serfs, and all their things to have without a word. And if you want to ask about any other matters, we are willing to make provisions to you. But if you are to stand resolute and not give in amiably, let this be known to you that, exactly as we plundered Thessalonica and we destroyed the churches, and we deserted and ruined everything, in the same way we will destroy both yourselves and your things, and the (reason) for the wrong-doing may god seek from yourselves].

It is time now to turn our attention to how the news of the fall of Thessalonica is broken to the reader. Sphrantzes is quite brief with regard to this. In his edition Maisano offers two possibilities of the same passage. The first is fairly flegmatic: '᾽Εν ᾧ δὴ μαρτίῳ μηνὶ καὶ ἀμηρᾶς ὁ Μουράτμπεϊς τὴν Θεσσαλονίκην ἐπῆρεν ἀπὸ τοὺς Βενετίκους πολέμῳ'[6] [So in the month of March, Murad-bei took Thessalonica from the Venetians by war]. The second is coloured with the word θεόργιστοι (= those who anger god): 'ὅτι εἰς 1430 εἶχαν ἐπάρην οἱ θεόργιστοι οἱ τοῦρκοι τὴν θεσσαλονίκην ἀπὸ τὰς χεῖρας τῶν βενετίκων'[7] [that in 1430 they had taken, the god-angering Turks, Thessalonica from the hands of the Venetians].

In Chalkokondyles we read similarly that 'εἵλέ τε κατὰ κράτος τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἠνδραποδίσατο'[8] [and he subdued the city by compulsion and made it captive]. He also says that 'ἐγένετο μὲν οὖν αὕτη μεγίστη δὴ τοῖς Ἕλλησι συμφορά, καὶ οὐδεμιᾶς τῶν πρόσθεν γενομένων αὐτοῖς συμφορῶν λειπομένη.' [and this became the biggest calamity to the Greeks, and it did not fall behind any of the other calamities that came before it]; and that 'ἡ μέντοι πόλις αὕτη Ἑλληνὶς μεγάλη τε οὖσα καὶ εὐδαίμων ἑάλω ὑπὸ ᾽Αμουράτεω. τὴν μέντοι πόλιν ἐπέτρεπε τοῖς αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ τῶν περιοίκων ἐνοικῆσαι.' [and indeed this Greek city which was great and fortunate was taken by Murad. Indeed he allowed the city to be inhabited by his own people who were dwelling in the hinterland].[9]

To be addressed as Ἑλληνὶς by the Athenian Chalkokondyles is a high complement to the city, alluding to a classical past. In his

fondness of the literary heritage, in fact, he calls Thessalonica by its ancient name, Θέρμη (Therme): 'τὴν μέντοι Θέρμην τῆς Μακεδονίας ἀπέδοντο Ἑνετοῖς, ἀδύνατα εἶναι νομίζοντες σφίσι παραδοῦναι τὴν πόλιν ἐς τὸν περιόντα τότε Ἀμουράτεω.' [10] [and however they gave over Therme of Macedonia to the Venetians, believing that it is impossible to them to consign the city to the then hovering Murad]. Therme was already in existence while, under Philip II of Macedonia, Pella was the capital of the Macedonian lands. Therme was situated pretty much in the location where later Thessalonica was founded. Today it is a suburb of the modern city.

Doukas in a relatively extensive passage brands the events that took place as 'ἀπαρχὴ κακὴ καὶ ἀπαίσιος τῶν μελλόντων κακῶν ἐν τῇ βασιλευούσῃ.'[11] [a start (that is) bad and ominous of the future defilements in the vasileuousa (= Constantinople)]. In that he relates the event to the future, and not to the past, which is what Chalkokondyles did in the above passage. In horror, he also likens the Turkish soldiers to a swarm of bees: 'καὶ ἀνοίξαντες μίαν πύλην, ὡς σμῆνος μελισσῶν ἅπας ὁ στρατὸς ἐντὸς εἰσῄει'[12] [and after they opened one gate, like a swarm of bees the entire army entered inside]. The sense of panic is even more intensely shown by the fact that the Venetians were taken with fear: 'οἱ Βενετικοὶ στείλαντες ἀποκρισαρίους ἐποίησαν εἰρήνην, φοβούμενοι μή πως ὀλέσωσι καὶ τὴν Εὔβοιαν'[13] [the Venetians, sending messengers, made peace, fearing that they may also lose Euvoia].

There is a hint of an emotional charge in Doukas in the description of the scenes of the fallen city: 'ἐγυμνώθησαν οἶκοι, ἐρημώθησαν ναοί, ἐκκλησιῶν εὐπρέπειαι, κειμήλια ἱερὰ ἐν χερσὶν μιαρῶν, παρθένοι σεμναὶ ἐν ἀγκάλες ἀσώτων, γυναῖκες εὐγενεῖς ἐν χερσὶν ἀγενῶν, καὶ τὰ πάντα κακά.'[14] [Homes were bared, temples were relinquished, the comeliness of the churches, the sacred heirlooms in the hands of the polluted, modest virgins in the arms of the profligate, noble women in the hands of the brutes, and all the calamities]. Yet his description is mute in comparison with John Anagnostes, who wrote an eyewitness account. Anagnostes says that:

οὐ γὰρ ἐδύναντο καὶ τούτους ἕλκειν μακρὰν ἀπερχόμενοι καὶ πρὸς πόλεμον ἕτερον. εἶδες ἂν οὖν τοὺς δυστυχεῖς τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς ἑῴας τοὺς δ᾽ ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς ἑσπέρας μέρη διασπαρέντας· οἱ μὲν γὰρ τοὺς τεκόντας οἱ δὲ τὰ τέκνα καὶ ἕτεροι τὰς γυναῖκας ἐλάμβανον, *καὶ οὕς ἡ φύσις ἥνωσεν, ἡ συμφορὰ διεμέρισεν*.[15] [and they were not able to both carry those coming from far, and going towards another war. And you saw the infelicitous, some at dawn and some at dusk to be thrown asunder; and these were taking the forbears, and those the children, and others the women, *and those whom nature united, the misadventure tore apart* (italic type mine for emphasis)].

In wonderment he observes how the larnax of St Demetrius is treated: ‘Τί δ᾽ ἂν εἴποις περὶ τῆς μυροδόχου τιμίας λάρνακος τοῦ ἡμεδαποῦ τροπαιούχου καὶ μάρτυρος;’[16] [And what can one say about the honoured larnax of our native-born trophy winner and martyr?]. The graves were not left alone either: ‘καὶ καταβέβλητο μνήματα καὶ τὰ τούτοις ἐναποκείμενα λείψανα κατὰ γῆς ἀπερρίφησαν’[17] [and they slew the graves, and the remnants that were placed there upon the earth, they despised].

Anagnostes reports jealousy on the part of the Turkish soldiers regarding the healing myrrh of St Demetrius. This jealousy seems to motivate their ravaging behaviour. Having taken their freedom, they also want to take away their last source of consolation, the miraculous healing myrrh of the saint. The reputation of St Demetrius as a healing saint is here pronounced by the fact that the Turks are also aware of the healing cult:

ἐνταῦθα δὲ δυοῖν εἵνεκα, τοῦ τε περὶ αὐτὴν οὐκ ὀλίγου χρυσῷ καὶ ἀργύρῳ καὶ λίθοις τιμίοις καὶ μαργάροις κατεσκευασμένου κόσμου, καὶ τῶν ὑγείας παρεκτικῶν θείων μύρων. οἱ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ κόσμου μόνον αὐτὴν ἀπεγύμνωσαν, οἱ δὲ βασκήναντες οἷον ἡμῖν τῆς ἀφθονίας τῶν μύρων καὶ τῆς ἐκ τούτων ἰάσεως ἀφῃρηκέναι καὶ ταῦθ᾽ ἡμᾶς ἠβουλήθησαν, ὡς μηδὲν ἔχειν τοῦ λοιποῦ τούτων ἀπολαύειν, ὁσάκις ἂν ἕκαστος δέοιτο. διὸ καὶ καταβεβληκότες τὰς ἐπ᾽ αὐτῇ μαρμάρους τῶν μύρων ἔσπευδον αὐτὴν ἐκκενῶσαι καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ θεῖον λείψανον τοῦ μάρτυρος ἐκβαλεῖν· ἡγοῦντο γὰρ τοῦ σκοποῦ τούτου κατατυχεῖν καὶ ἡμᾶς τῶν ἀκενώτων μύρων καταλιπεῖν ἐνδεεῖς[18] [here there were two types, in respect of the decoration, which was made with not a small amount of gold and silver and precious stones and pearls, and the health-containing divine myrrh fluids. Some only have

> stripped (the larnax) from the decorations, but some through exactly being jealous of our abundance of the myrrh and of our healing from it, they wished to take (the myrrh) away from us, so that we could not have the opportunity to enjoy it in the future, however much each (of us) implored for it. Therefore, having overthrown the marbles that were laid on it, they were hurrying to empty it (= the larnax) and to cast out the holy and divine remnant of the martyr; for they were thinking that they will obtain that objective and they would leave us destitute of the myrrh that cannot be emptied].

It seems important for Anagnostes to point out in relation to their attitude to the myrrh, that the laws of man are inferior to the laws of God, and the myrrh therefore cannot be extinguished. This is also a symbol of identity for the subjugated people, who find satisfaction and a sense of unity in the continuation of their religious traditions:

> καὶ τοῖς μὲν ὡς τι γελοῖον ἐδόκει· οἷς δὲ νοῦς ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπῆν, τούτοις ἦν ἐπιμελὲς πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτῶν τοῦτο μετακομίζειν καὶ μετ᾽ αἰδοῦς ἅπτεσθαι καὶ σεβάσματος· ἠκηκόεισαν γὰρ πρὸς τῶν πεπειραμένων ὡς ἰατρικῶν φαρμάκων ἐστὶν ἐνεργέστερον, εἰς οἷον ἄν τις χρήσαιτο πάθος. πλὴν ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐδύναντο τὴν τῶν μύρων πηγὴν ξηρὰν καὶ ἄνικμον ἀποφῆναι, καίπερ πολὺν ὑπὲρ τούτου ποιούμενοι τὸν ἀγῶνα. καὶ εἰκότως· οὐ γὰρ ἴσα τοῖς ἀνθρωπίνοις τὰ πρὸς θεοῦ τοῖς ἀξίοις κεχαρισμένα, ἐπειδήπερ μηδὲ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὑπόκεινται ὅροις.[19] [and to the first the matter seemed laughable; but the others had a mind superior to those, and they moved it towards their own (dwelling) and they handled it with modesty and respect; because they heard from those who were experienced that it is most active as a medical drug, if one uses it for whatever manner of suffering. Except that they could not make the source of the myrrh to be proven dry and unmoistured, despite the fact that precisely they made great effort towards that goal. And fairly; because the human things are not equal to those given to the worthy ones by god, because they are not subject to the same rules with these].

The plundering and defilement hurts Anagnostes's theological sensibilities and religious feeling: καὶ τὰς θείας τραπέζας, ἐφ᾽ αἷς *ἡ θεία μυστικὴ καὶ ζῶσα καὶ σωστικὴ παντὸς ἐπετελεῖτο τοῦ κόσμου θυσία,* τῇ τῶν χρημάτων ἐπιθυμίᾳ κατὰ σπουδὴν ἀνατρέπειν καὶ καταπάτημα φεῦ τοῖς βουλομένοις τιθέναι[20] [and the holy tables, *on which the holy, mystical, and living, and all-saving sacrifice of the world took place*, for the desire of money with

haste they reverse, and alas they trample all over anyone (italics mine)]. Note how the holy communion is called holy and mystical, and living, and saving: this is very much in tune with the highly charged theological climate of Thessalonica in the late years, and the intensification of devotion in the face of adversity. In agreement to this all-pervasive climate, Anagnostes recalls how the night before the fall πάσης τε σχεδὸν ἡλικίας οὔσης ἐν ἐγρηγόρσει, δεήσεις ἐκτενεῖς θεῷ καὶ τῷ μυροβλύτῃ μάρτυρι καθ᾽ ὅλην ἐκείνην προσαγόντων τὴν νύκτα[21] [almost every age was in alert, making extensive entreaties in holy procession to god and to the myrovlyte martyr[22] throughout that night]. The unquestionable dominance of St Demetrius in the city and in the minds of its inhabitants is manifested in the way they look to him for comfort in their hour of extreme danger.

But what happened straight after the fall of Thessalonica? As it is stated starkly in Doukas: 'ἐν μιᾷ οὖν ἡμέρᾳ κενωθεῖσα ἡ τοσαύτη πόλις ἔμεινεν ἔρημος.'[23] [in one day having been emptied, this so great a city was left forsaken]. So the repopulation of Thessalonica was for Murad II to consider, who acted accordingly.[24] Anagnostes praises Murad II for his forward-thinking vision.[25] Still, in Anagnostes's writing it becomes alive for what reason 'ἡ πόλις ὥσπερ τινὰ πενθήρη χιτῶνα τὴν ἀκοσμίαν περιεβάλετο'[26] [the city exactly like a mournful tunic was wearing unruliness]. Beauty is important to the city for its pride and sense of identity, so its loss brings grief. To a large extent it is about how the new situation has changed the citizens in themselves and in the way they interact with their environment. The churches that Doukas mentioned in passing, here are lamented not only for their physical deterioration, but also for the way in which they desert our memory: 'καὶ μονουχὶ τῶν γηραιοτέρων ἔξεστιν ἀκούειν ἀνδρῶν ὡς ὧδε μὲν ἦν ὁ νεὼς ὁ δεῖνα ἐκεῖ δὲ ὁ δεινα, καὶ ὅσα προσῆν ἑκάστῳ καὶ κάλλη καὶ χάριτες'[27] [and only from the older men it was possible to hear (saying) that here was this church, and there was that church, and all the beauties and graces that were attached to each].

The old men in the above passage cause sorrow, not only for their descriptions of past glories, but also for the destruction in their

lives that is apparent in their present demeanour. And there are more direct references to the triggers of grief and tears that the symbols of former beauty and devotion of the city have become:

> μοναὶ δ᾽, ἅς πρότερον φθάσας ὁ λόγος ἐδήλωσεν, *ἀφορμὴ τοῖς ὁρῶσιν ἵστανται πένθους*, μὴ ὅτι γε μοναχῶν ἔρημοι καταστᾶσαι κακῶς ἐξελαθέντων καὶ πρὸς ἑτέρας πόλεις μετοικησάντων, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσαφῃρημέναι τὴν διὰ πάντων λαμπρότητα· αἵ τε γὰρ μάρμαροι τούτων ἐξιδαφίσθησαν, ἥ τ᾽ ἄλλη ἅπασα ὕλη ἡ πρὸς ἀπαρτισμὸν αὐτῶν ἀρχῆθεν συντεθειμένη καὶ κάλλος εἰς διαρπαγὴν τοῖς βουλομένοις ἀνεῖτο, καὶ νῦν ἄκοσμόν τι θέαμα πᾶσιν ὁρῶνται *καὶ τὰς ἁπάντων ψυχὰς κινοῦσι πρὸς δάκρυα*[28] [and the monasteries, as the discourse mentioned before by arriving to that point, *stand as a pretext to the observers for grief*, not only because they are desolate of monks who were driven out of them badly and went to live in other towns, but also because they have been stripped from their long-standing glory; and their marbles were demolished, and every other material that was composed together for their erection from the start, and every beauty was returned for plundering to whoever wanted to, and now they are an uncomely sight to be seen by all, *and they move everyone's souls to tears* (again, the italic type is added by myself for emphasis)].

In these few examples it is already distinguishable how Anagnostes much more than any of the other writers we have discussed exposes his emotional world to the reader. But how does his Monody differ to his Narration? Or are the two texts virtually interchangeable? The answer is to be sought not in the emotional intensity, but in the nature of the two pieces and their form. In the Monody there is much less about what happened and much more about how it has changed him internally. It is written in the form of funeral laments, as the personification of a city as a woman, although not explicit here, may be thought to be present and is a part of the Greek literary tradition.

His Monody is punctuated by dramatic exclamations that provide the text with its literary structure, and are the facilitator for his expression of deep and tormented sorrow.[29] Its very opening is a proclamation of pain and disbelief. His first words are:

> Τίς ἂν εἰδὼς πάθεσι θρήνους ἐξισοῦν τὴν Θεσσαλονικέων ἀξίως πόλιν ὠδύρετο; πόλις γὰρ αὕτη τὰς ἄλλας ὅσον ἐν εὐτυχίᾳ πολλῷ τῷ μέτρῳ παρήνεγκε, πανταχόθεν αὕτην λαμπρὰν καὶ ποθεινὴν δεικνῦσα,

τοσοῦτο νῦν ἀτυχέστατα πέπραγε καὶ θρηνῳδίας ἁπάσης ὑπόθεσις πρόκειται.[30] [Which person who has seen its sufferings can lament with elegies the city of the Thessalonians to equivalent measure (to its misfortune)? As much as this city exceeded the others in blessedness in ample measure, to the same extent it has been brought into an unfortunate state, so that (now) the foundation for every threnody lies before us].

The stark polarity is described in more detail in another passage. Note how the freedom to participate in the rituals and the religious life of the city are rated highly amongst his yearning memories of prosperity. In fact the whole paragraph is a description of the splendour of religious practice:

ὦ πῶς ὁ τῆς εὐημερίας ἡμῖν καιρὸς ἐπιθέσεως καὶ καταδρομῆς γέγονε, καὶ καταλειφθέντες αἰσχύνη καὶ ὄνειδος γεγενήμεθα. οἴχονται πανηγύρεις, οἴχονται θείων ἐκτυπωμάτων λαμπρότητες. ἀπόλωλε παρρησία. τὸ τῶν μοναχῶν ἀπελήλαται τάγμα, καὶ πολιαὶ πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων σεμνότης ἐν τοῖς ἀτίμοις λογίζονται.[31] [o, how the time of prosperity has become one of attack and raid, and having been taken, we have amounted to shame and reproach. Absent are the festivals, absent are the displays of divine figures. Lost is the courage of speech (about the faith). The body of the monks has been lost, and the guards of the priests and solemnity of the deacons are regarded amongst unhonoured things].

Because the Monody is released from the obligation to relate to the sequence of disasters, which is done in the Narration, Anagnostes has more freedom to display the same mournful sentiments and thoughts but in a more penetrating way. The happiness of the past is more reason for lamenting the present misfortune. He remembers how the city was an attraction to all to come and live in it. In a very visual passage he demonstrates what an imposing metropolis Thessalonica really was. He likens the city to a compass, and the people all over the world to metal particles that are being attracted to it. So strongly they feel compelled to come and build their lives there: ‘ὦ πῶς μαγνήτιδος τρόπον εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἅπαντας εἵλκεν’ [o, how like a compass (the city) attracted everyone to itself].[32] And the people who came in got on brilliantly with the locals, because the city δεσμοῖς τ’ ἀλύτοις φιλίας συνέδει[33] [with bonds of unbroken friendship (the city) used to link (the citizens who came to it with the locals)].

He wonders in his mind about the value of human life and its supposed superiority to death, which he argues is in certain cases reversed: ‘ἆρ᾽ οὐκ ἀβίωτος ὁ βίος ἡμῶν ἐστί, καὶ ἧττον τοῦ ζῆν τὸ θανεῖν ἐστὶ πικραῖς οὕτω βαλλομένοις καθ᾽ ἑκάστην ὀδύναις; ἤπου γε πάντες ἄν μοι συμφθέγξαιντο οἳ πάσχειν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις πεφύκεσαν.’[34] [indeed, isn’t our life unlivable, and isn’t dying lesser (in bitterness) than living in the bitter misfortunes that are thrown on us with every sadness? Perhaps at any rate all have been jointly guilty with me, those who suffer in such (misfortunes) that have appeared]. Here life and death are both presented as sufferings, of which death is the lesser. In another visually stimulating passage, this of an imaginary physical disaster, he expresses his preference to such an event than to subjugation, which is a painful and unbearable reality that hurts the souls of the citizens with painful bites:

> ὦ θεοῦ ἀνοχὴ, πῶς τοιούτων ἠνέσχου; βέλτιον ἂν ἦν τὴν γῆν διασχοῦσαν καλύψαι ἢ τοῦτον ταῦτα μετασκευασθῆναι τὸν τρόπον. κρε∂ττον ἂν ἦν ἑνὶ τῆς γῆς ἀνατιναγμῷ ταυτὶ καταπεπτωκέναι καὶ μηδὲ λείψανα γοῦν ἐναπολελε∂φθαι τῷ τόπfl˚ τότε γὰρ οὐ τοσοῦτο τὰς τῶν ὁρώντων ψυχὰς ἔδακνεν ἂν τὸ πάθος.[35] [o forbearance of god, how did you tolerate such things? Because it would be better to cover the earth after splitting it, than to transfigure those things in such a manner. (Because) it would be superior, besides, to fall to the ground by explosion, and for no remnants to be left to the place; then such strong suffering would not be biting the souls of the beholders.]

His philosophical outlook extends to an appraisal of the nature of time: καλῶς σε, πρὸς τὸ παλίντροπον ἀπιδόντες, τροχὸν τὸ τῶν σοφῶν ὠνομάκασι γένος· πάντα γὰρ ἄνω καὶ κάτω μετατίθης καὶ περιφέρεις.[36] [aptly, for turning backwards and forwards, the philosophers have named you a wheel; because you move and turn everything upside down].

He shows his personal suffering to us clearly, which is expressed physically: ἰλίγγου πληροῦμαι[37] [I am filled with giddiness]; and also: ‘ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν καὶ σύνδακρυς σοῦ μεμνημένος καθίσταμαι, *καὶ τὸ προφητικὸν εἰπεῖν, σκότος λεπτόν με καλύπτει*, καὶ παραμυθίαν ζητῶν ταὐτά μοι

πάσχειν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους εὑρίσκω.'[38] [and I stand tearful remembering you (= the city), *and the prophet's, so to speak, thin darkness covers me*[39], and in looking for consolation I find that these things are suffered by me and by others (italics mine)]. The expression of his pain here is powerful. This picture of the author emerges, walking in the city feeling dizzy, and in disconsolate bewilderment. This is a very modern passage, where individual suffering is manifested in an open and undiluted manner, and without any attempt to smooth out the deeply felt sense of loss at a personal level.

His suffering pierces him through. He finds it unworkable to speak of Thessalonica without bursting to tears: 'λέγειν οὐδὲν ἔπεισιν ἄλλο ταύτης γε πέρι ἢ ψυχὴν ὅσαπερ ἐς ἀθυμίαν ἐμβάλλει πηγάς τε δακρύων ἐξ ὀμμάτων προχεῖσθαι παρασκευάζει. πολλὰς μὲν γὰρ κάλλει καὶ θέσει, πολλὰς δὲ μεγέθει καὶ τῇ τῶν καλῶν ἀφθονίᾳ μηδ᾽ ὅσον εἰπεῖν ὑπερέβαλε πόλεις.'[40] [And (one) can say no other words about the city without the soul rushing into despondency and producing springs of tears to stream forth from the eyes. Many cities it surpassed in delights and situation, and many in (its) size and in the abundance of goods, more than one can relate]. His fellow-citizens share his despondency, as by his description 'καὶ σκηπτοὶ οὐρανόθεν οὐ καταφέρονται.'[41] [and cast down, they do not carry their gaze towards heaven]. Faithful to the literary tradition, where the poet (e.g. Homer) speaks directly to his heroes, he turns to Thessalonica to say that οἳ γάρ σε τροφὸν οἴδασι καὶ μητέρα[42] [and they (the citizens) know you as a nurse and a mother]. In sorrow, he calls the city ζοφερὰν[43] [gloomy].

He finds it so hard to come to terms with the new situation that he calls it a strange situation: ὦ πράγματος ξένου. ἔνθα πόνοι τῆς ἀσκητικῆς τοῦ παντὸς ἐτιμῶντο παλαίστρας, νυνὶ θεοστυγῆ διαπράττεται.[44] [o thing that we are unacquainted with. Where the labours of the ascetic arena were always honoured before now, at present, deeds hated by god are carried out]. In referring to the acts of the enemy against sacred things, he contrasts them to the citizens' own deeply-held respect: 'ἡμῖν μὲν καὶ τὸ εἰσιέναι ἔνδον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου φοβερὸν εἶναι ἐδόκει, καὶ μόνοις ἦν εἰσιτητὸν τοῖς τεταγμένοις ἐν τούτῳ, ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα

πρότερον σφίσι καθηραμένοις·'[45] [indeed we believe that entering within the altar is frightful (meaning terrible or awesome), and that it is admissible only to the ones instructed to it, who have first atoned both their soul and body]. It therefore pains him that the places of worship may be mocked by the intruders: 'ὦ τόπων θεῷ ἀφωσιωμένων! ἣν ἐπλουτεῖτε θείαν ἀφῄρησθε χάριν, καὶ τοῖς τολμηταῖς παρὰ φαῦλον λογίζεσθε.'[46] [o places dedicated to god! you have been deprived from the divine grace in which you were rich, and, by bold men, you are not regarded anything but worthless].

When disaster strikes, it is natural to ask oneself why it may be so. In his mind Anagnostes searched agonizingly for an answer as to why such a turn of events may have been permissible by God: 'ἠπόρησα οὖν πολλάκις κατ᾽ ἐμαυτὸν ἀνθ᾽ ὅτου ταῦτα, καὶ πῶς εἰς τοσοῦτον ἥκομεν κακοπραγίας οἱ πεπονθότες. καὶ εὗρον λύοντά μοι τὸν θεῖον λόγον τὴν ἀπορίαν, «ἔσται» λέγοντα «ἡ γῆ ὑμῶν ἔρημος καὶ αἱ ἐπαύλεις ὑμῶν ἔρημοι, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐπορεύθητε πρὸς ἐμὲ πλάγιοι, κἀγὼ πορεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν θυμῷ πλαγίῳ.»'[47] [I was much perplexed in myself against these things, and how we have come to such ill condition (us,) the sufferers. And I found the holy word resolving my inquiry, 'be', saying, 'your land barren and your courtyards barren, because you carried yourselves towards me in an oblique way, and I will convey myself towards you with an oblique anger.']. This seems to be a welcome discovery for Anagnostes, as it explains the misfortune in metaphysical terms, and gives him comparative solace.[48] It may be pointed out here that laymen as well as clerics were thinking along the lines of seeking a theological explanation to the realities of their time as can be seen throughout Byzantine literature. It shows that the notion of trusting themselves to the Lord and, in the case of Thessalonica, also to St Demetrius, rather than to the emperor, had an appeal throughout the local population. Anagnostes himself was probably a lower cleric or layman with church duties, as his name, Reader, suggests.

To conclude, Anagnostes provides us with two fine examples of vivid and emotionally rich Byzantine literature. While in agreement with the other writers of the fall of Thessalonica about the framework of events

that took place, he gives us a much greater insight into the psychology of the city and into city life under the new regime. His work is a valuable source not only for the events during the last years of the empire, but also for gaining some understanding regarding the way in which the Byzantines perceived themselves and sought consolation and a sense of direction and identity in the face of their world crumbling before their eyes.

He closes his Monody in gentle style, perhaps echoing the lamenting Jeremiah, when he urges his fellow citizens to join him in song: 'ὡς ἂν ἐντεῦθεν ᾄσωμεν χαριέστατα.'[49] [for which henceforth let us sing very gracefully].

Epilogue

In the pages of this book I have tried to capture the overwhelming power of the cult of St Demetrius. Here as an epilogue I will simply use a metaphor from modern literature to show the extent of that adoration.

In literature there are instances where a whole work is a metaphor for a time or for a people. There are also instances where a central character is a metaphor for Christ Himself. Such a work may be the novella *Billy Budd, Sailor* by Herman Melville. Billy, 'the handsome sailor', is in Melville's Christian typology the *Estauromenos*, the Crucified Christ. In his redemptive death he saves his executor (Captain Vere). In his youthful beauty he is adored by his peers. Many interpretations have been offered of this complex masterpiece as of Melville's work as a whole. To examine one alone, Benjamin Britten has expressed his very subtly by shifting the emphasis from Billy to Captain Vere in his music. We know this because Peter Pears had always sung the leading role in Britten's operas and in the opera *Billy Budd*, Billy is the baritone (first performance by Theodor Uppman, 1 December 1951) and Captain Vere the tenor (first performance by Peter Pears). The libretto, authored by E.M. Foster and Eric Crozier, daringly changed the dramatic shift of the novella. Melville's *Billy Budd, Sailor* is unfinished, as it was cut short by the author's death in 1891. Britten with his librettists have finished off the plot with an ending that shows an old Captain Vere reflecting on the redemptive power of Billy and finding peace in it. So the high point in the opera is not Billy's death but Vere's realisation.

What Britten has done in his *Billy Budd*, my Byzantine authors have done with the image of St Demetrius. Their interpretations are wide-ranging and they thrill the reader with their unexpected twists. In their allusions to the figure of Christ as a model for the hero's life they are

equally explicit. St Demetrius is praised as Christ's imitator, as Christ-like; he is even said to be equal to Christ in his martyrdom. The citizens of Thessalonica turned to St Demetrius, in prayer, in their hour of need as their Protector, rather than turning to God. He is thought of as the finest among the saints and superior to Alexander the Great, who conquered the world but did not achieve supernatural glory. He is, in turn, compared to the Psalmist David for the beauty of his soul. His martyrdom is described in several texts in great detail, to show how all the elements in it make Demetrius a type of Christ. Among them, the lance that pierced the Lord's side compared with the piercings of the side of Demetrius play a central part. It is striking how Demetrius is repeatedly described as unafraid and willing to be slain in the sources. In both his fearlessness and readiness for death he is the Billy Budd of the Middle Ages. The extraordinary personal beauty accentuates those two qualities in both men. In the memory of the people Billy Budd enjoyed the same affection as Demetrius did. Herman Melville has at least one ballad written in his honour and speaks of the chips from the piece of wood from where he was suspended being venerated like the True Cross.

On another note, between 1886–1891 when the composition of *Billy Budd, Sailor* took place, the argument against capital punishment was raging in the State of New York. It was natural for the New York-born Melville to have responded to it. The history of the debate is too involved to be presented here. Melville's novella, however, was one of the works of literature that stirred consciences round the world. In England it was read alongside Oscar Wilde's *Ballad of Reading Gaol*, published in 1898. The two works were amongst those that contributed to the swing of public opinion, until in 1965 the death penalty for murder in the UK was finally abolished. The connection between *Billy Budd, Sailor* and its context has been obscured by the fact that the novella was long lost amongst the author's papers at his death and not published until 1924, while the correct text of the work was established only in 1962.

The moral, social, religious and political issues that concerned the authors of the encomia discussed in this study were as fiercely debated.

Notes

Introduction

1. On the cult of St Demetrius among the Slavs, see Dimitri Obolensky, 'The cult of St Demetrius of Thessaloniki in the history of Byzantine-Slav relations', in Dimitri Obolensky, *Byzantium and the Slavs* (Crestwood NY, 1994), pp. 280–300; V. Tapkova-Zaimova, 'Le culte de saint Démétrius à Byzance et aux Balkans', *Miscellanea Bulgarica* 5 (1987), 139–46.
2. Timothy D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge MA, 1962), pp. 32–5, 37–8; A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale, J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, AD 260–640*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1971–90), i. 253–4, 573–4.
3. Nicholas Kavasilas, 'Εἰς τὸν πανάγιον Δημήτριον καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ θαύματα' in *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα, Επτά Ανέκδοτοι Λόγοι το πρώτον νυν εκδιδόμενοι,* ed. Vassileios Pseutongás (Thessalonica, 1976), pp. 135–42, at 138.
4. Gregory Palamas, 'Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὁμιλία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις μεγαλομάρτυρα καὶ θαυματουργὸν καὶ μυροβλύτην Δημήτριον', *Gregorii Thessalonicensis Orationes X*, ed. Christian Friedrich Matthaei (Moscow, 1776), pp. 44–60, at 53.
5. Paul Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius et de la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans*, 2 vols (Paris, 1979).
6. Symeon Metaphrastes, 'St Demetrii Martyris Acta', *PG* 116. 1081–1426; Photios, *Bibliothèque*, ed. René Henry, 9 vols (Paris, 1974), vii. 213–5; Anonymous Life in Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Gr. 821; Andreas Xyngopoulos, 'Βυζαντινὸν κιβωτίδιον μετὰ παραστάσεων ἐκ τοῦ βίου τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου', *Archaeologike Ephimeris* (1936–7), 101–36, at 104, 135. A catalogue of texts relating to St Demetrius, edited and unedited, with cross-references, can be found in François Halkin, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* (Brussels, 1957).
7. Teodora Burnand, 'Donors and Iconography: The Case of the Church "St. Virgin" in Dolna Kamenitsa (XIV c.)', in *Spirituality in late Byzantium; Essays Presenting New Research by International Scholars*, ed. Eugenia Russell (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2009), pp. 99–105, at p. 102.
8. *Digenes Akritis: the Grottaferrata and Escorial Versions*, ed. and transl. Elizabeth Jeffreys (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 2–5.
9. The translation is that of Elizabeth Jeffreys (above).
10. For the origins of the cult, see Michael J. Vickers, 'Sirmium or Thessaloniki? A critical examination of the St. Demetrius legend', *BZ* 67 (1974), 337–50; J.C.

Skedros, *Saint Demetrios of Thessaloniki: Civic Patron and Divine Protector 4th–7th Centuries CE* (Harrisburg PA, 1999); Woods, 'Thessalonica's patron', 221–34. For St Demetrius as protector of Thessalonica, see Walter, 'Myroblytos', 157–78; Robin Cormack, *Writing in Gold: Byzantine Society and its Icons* (London, 1985), pp. 50–94.

11. Paul Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius et de la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans*, 2 vols (Paris, 1979), pp. 195, 216–7.
12. A.A. Vasiliev, 'An edict of the Emperor Justinian II, September 688', *Speculum* 18 (1943), 1–13, at 3; idem, 'The historical significance of the mosaic of St Demetrius at Sassoferrato', *DOP* 5 (1950), 31–9, at 36–7.
13. John Skylitzes, *Synopsis Historiarum*, ed. J. Thurn, CFHB 5 (Berlin and New York, 1973), pp. 339, 413.
14. Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, ed. B. Leib, 3 vols (Paris, 1937–45), ii. 25. English translation E.R.A. Sewter, *The Alexiad of Anna Comnena* (Harmondsworth, 1969), p. 169.
15. Robert of Clari, *The Conquest of Constantinople*, trans. E.H. McNeal (Toronto, 1996), p. 127; Obolensky, 'Cult of St Demetrius', 295–6; Robert Browning, 'Byzantine Thessalonike: a unique city?', *Dialogos* 2 (1995), 91–104, at 95.
16. Jonathan Harris, *Constantinople: Capital of Byzantium* (London and New York, 2007), p. 174.
17. John Kaminiates, *The Capture of Thessaloniki*, ed. and trans. David Frendo and Athanasios Fotiou, Byzantina Australiensia 12 (Perth, 2000), pp. 38–41; Eustathios of Thessalonica, *The Capture of Thessaloniki*, ed. and trans. John R. Melville-Jones, Byzantina Australiensia 8 (Canberra, 1988), pp. 140–1; Frendo, 'The miracles of St. Demetrius', 205–24.
18. Kaminiates, *Capture of Thessaloniki*, pp. 20–1. In general, see George and Mary Soteriou, *Ἡ Βασιλική τοῦ Ἁγίου Δημητρίου Θεσσαλονίκης* (Athens, 1952); Raymond Janin, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins (Bithynie, Hellespont, Latros, Galèsios, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique)*, (Paris, 1975), pp. 365–72; Paul Hetherington, *Byzantine and Medieval Greece: Churches, Castles and Art* (London, 1991), pp. 205–7.
19. Charalambos Bakirtzis, 'The urban continuity and size of late Byzantine Thessalonike', *DOP* 57 (2003), 35–64, at 49–50; idem, 'Pilgrimage to Thessalonike: the tomb of St. Demetrios', *DOP* 56 (2002), 175–92.
20. Comnena, *Alexiade*, i. 89; trans. Sewter, p. 93.
21. Bakirtzis, 'Pilgrimage to Thessalonike', 179.
22. Ruth J. Macrides, 'Subversion and loyalty in the cult of St. Demetrios', *Byzantinoslavica* 51 (1990), 189–97; Paul Magdalino, 'Saint Demetrios and Leo VI', *Byzantinoslavica* 51 (1990), 198–201, at 198.
23. Macrides, 'Subversion and loyalty', 193, 195, 197.
24. For a discussion of the panegyris see Speros Vryonis, 'The panegyris of the Byzantine saint', in *The Byzantine Saint*, ed. Sergei Hackel (New York, 2001),

196–228; Sharon Gerstel, 'Civic and monastic influences on church decoration in late Byzantine Thessalonike', *DOP* 57 (2003), 225–39, at 229.

25. On this church, see Janin, *Églises et les monastères*, pp. 375–80; Hetherington, *Byzantine and Medieval Greece*, pp. 204–5; Bakirtzis, 'Urban continuity', 50.
26. Pseudo-Lucian, *Timarion*, ed. R. Romano, Byzantina et neo-hellenica neapolitana 2 (Naples, 1974), pp. 49–92, reprinted in *La satira bizantina dei secoli 11–15 : 'Il patriota', 'Caridemo', 'Timarione', Cristoforo di Mitilene, Michele Psello, Teodoro Prodromo, 'Carmi ptocoprodromici', Michele Haplucheir, Giovanni Catrara, 'Mazaris', 'La messa del glabro', 'Sinassario del venerabile asino'*, ed. Roberto Romano (Turin, 1999). The similarity in style is so strong, that the work had been believed to be by the second-century prose writer Lucian, hence the attribution 'Pseudo-Lucian'. In general on the festival, see Vassileios Laourdas, 'Ἐγκώμια εἰς τὸν Ἅγιον Δημήτριον κατὰ τὸν δέκατον τέταρτον αἰῶνα', *EEBS* 24 (1954), 275–90, at 276–7; Vryonis, '*Panegyris* of the Byzantine saint', pp. 202–4.
27. Jonathan Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades* (London and New York, 2003), p. 2.
28. John R. Melville-Jones, *Venice and Thessalonica 1423–1430: The Venetian Documents*, Archivio del Litorale Adriatico 7 (Padua, 2002), p. 120; K. Mertzios, *Μνημεῖα Μακεδονικῆς ἱστορίας* (Thessalonica, 1947), p. 57; Xyngopoulos, 'Καταφυγὴ-Ἀχειροποίητος', 447, note 5.
29. Eustathios of Thessalonica, *Capture of Thessaloniki*, pp. 116–17; Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. J.-L. Van Dieten, CFHB 11, 2 vols (Berlin and New York, 1975), i. 305–6, 371; Obolensky, 'Cult of St Demetrius', pp. 294–6; G. Prinzing, 'Demetrios-Kirche und Aseniden-Aufstand. Zur chronologischen Präzisierung der Frühphase des Aseniden-Aufstandes', *Zbornik radova vizantoloskog instituta* 38 (1999–2000), 257–65; Michael Angold, *The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1204: A Political History* (2nd edn, Harlow, 1997), pp. 304–5.
30. Bakirtzis, 'Pilgrimage to Thessalonike', 185, 192.
31. F. Miklosich and W. Müller, *Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi Sacra et Profana*, 6 vols (Vienna, 1860–90), i.175.
32. Nikephoros Gregoras, *Byzantina Historia*, ed. L. Schopen, CSHB, 2 vols (Bonn, 1829–30), i. 187.
33. Donald M. Nicol, *The Byzantine Lady: Ten Portraits, 1250–1500* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 52–8; John W. Barker, 'The problem of appanages in Byzantium during the Palaiologan period', *Byzantina* 3 (1971), 103–22.
34. Simon Harris suggests a much later date on the evidence of an imperial acclamation (Athens, National Library, 2622).
35. Philotheos Kokkinos, 'Encomium Gregorii Palamae', in *Ἁγιολογικὰ Ἔργα*, Α΄ Θεσσαλονικεῖς Ἅγιοι, ed. D. Tsames (Thessalonica, 1985), pp. 425–591, at 514; Nicholas Kavasilas, 'Le traité inédit "Sur L'usure" de Nicolas Cabasilas', ed. Rodolphe Guilland, in *Εἰς Μνήμην Σπυρίδωνος Λάμπρου* (Athens, 1935), 269–77, at 274; Nicol, *Byzantine Lady*, pp. 92–5; John W. Barker, 'Late

Byzantine Thessalonike: a second city's challenges and responses', *DOP* 57 (2003), 5–33, at 22.

36. J. Gouillard, 'Le synodikon de l' Orthodoxie, édition et commentaire', *Travaux et Mémoires* 2 (1967), 1–316, at 100–3, lines 869–73.
37. Bakirtzis, 'Urban continuity', 41.
38. For the importance of Thessalonica as a cultural centre in the Balkans see Apostolos E. Vakalopoulos, *Origins of the Greek Nation: The Byzantine Period, 1204–1461*, trans. Ian Moles (New Brunswick NJ, 1970), pp. 49–54; idem, 'Γενική θεώρηση τῆς παλαιολογείου ἐποχῆς στήν Θεσσαλονίκη', *CTPE*, pp. 45–51, at 46; Konstantinos Kalokyris, '῾Η θεολογία τοῦ φωτός καί ἡ παλαιολόγειος ζωγραφική', *CTPE*, pp. 343–54, at 354; Franz Tinnefeld, 'Intellectuals in late Byzantine Thessalonike', *DOP* 57 (2003), 153–72; Donald M. Nicol, 'Thessalonica as a cultural centre in the fourteenth century', *Η Θεσσαλονίκη μεταξύ Ανατολής και Δύσεως* (Thessalonica, 1982), pp. 121–31, reprinted in Nicol, *Studies in Late Byzantine History and Prosopography* (London, 1986), no. X.
39. Various dates have been suggested regarding the fall of Adrianople, 1361, 1369 and 1380. For more details see: I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, 'La conquête d'Andrinople par les Turcs: la pénétration turque en Thrace et la valeur des chroniques ottomanes', *Travaux et Mémoires* 1 (1965), 439–61; Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, 'The conquest of Adrianople by the Turks', *Studi Veneziani* 12 (1970), 211–17, and reprinted in Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, *Romania and the Turks* (London, 1985), No. XII; Halil Inalcık, 'The conquest of Edirne (1361)', *Archivum Ottomanicum* 3 (1971), 185–210; Donald M. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453* (2nd edn, Cambridge, 1993), p. 274; Jonathan Harris, 'Constantinople as City State, c. 1360–1453', in *Between Byzantines and Turks: Understanding the Late Medieval Mediterranean World*, ed. Catherine Holmes, Jonathan Harris and Eugenia Russell (Oxford, 2010, forthcoming).
40. John W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391–1425), A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1969), pp. 14, 23 and note 53.
41. Demetrius Kydones, *Correspondance*, ed. R.-J. Loenertz, 2 vols (Vatican City, 1956–60), i. 175.
42. Barker, 'Late Byzantine Thessalonike', 22. In general on Manuel in Thessalonica, see: George T. Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel Palaeologus in Thessalonica, 1382–1387*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 159 (Rome, 1960; Barker, *Manuel II*, pp. 43–65; Apostolos E. Vakalopoulos, *Ιστορία της Θεσσαλονίκης (316–1983)* (Thessalonica, 1997), pp. 163–4.
43. Nevra Necipoglu, 'The aristocracy in late Byzantine Thessalonike: a case study of the city's archontes (late 14th and early 15th centuries)', *DOP* 57 (2003), 133–51, at 133–4. Maksimovic refers to the 'collective rights' that were given to the citizens of Thessalonica, Veroia, and Rentina, in Ljubomir Maksimovic, 'Η Μακεδονία μεταξύ της Λατινικής και Σερβικής κατακτήσεως. Το

πρόβλημα της συνέχειας του βυζαντινού διοικητικού συστήματος', *Vyzantine Makedonia* (Thessalonica, 1995), pp. 195–207, at 205.

44. Barker, *Manuel II*, pp. 242–5.
45. Vakalopoulos, *Ιστορία της Θεσσαλονίκης*, p. 172; Aris Papazoglou, 'Η πολιορκία της Θεσσαλονίκης του 1416 και η συνθήκη ειρήνης μεταξύ του Ιωάννη Η΄ Παλαιολόγου και του Μωάμεθ Α΄', *Thessaloniki* 3 (1992), 45–57, at 50.
46. Barker, *Manuel II*, 322, 326, note 14.
47. George P. Majeska, *Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Washington DC, 1984), pp. 190, 287.
48. J.P. Thomas and A.C. Hero, *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: a Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*, 5 vols (Washington DC, 2000), iii. 1237–53 and iv. 1505–11. On the monastery of St Demetrius, see Raymond Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin: première partie: le siège de Constantinople et le patriarchat oecumenique. Tome III: les églises et les monastères* (2nd edn, Paris, 1969), pp. 92–4. On the worship of St Demetrius in Constantinople in general see ibid. pp. 92–9.
49. Manuel Philes, *Carmina*, ed. E. Miller, 2 vols (Paris, 1855–7), i. 133–7; Andreas Xyngopoulos, Ὁ εἰκονογραφικὸς κύκλος τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Ἁγίου Δημητρίου (Thessalonica, 1970), pp. 47–9, 58–60; A. Frolow, 'Un nouveau reliquaire byzantin', *Revue des Études Grecques* 66 (1953), 100–10; André Grabar, 'Un nouveau reliquaire de St Demetrios', *DOP* 8 (1954), 305–13; Walter, 'Myroblytos', 164, with a much freer translation.
50. Walter, 'Myroblytos', at 168–9. See *PLP*, 1178–1195, entries for the Apokaukos family.
51. Hetherington, *Byzantine and Medieval Greece*, pp. 161–3.
52. David R. Sear, *Byzantine Coins and their Values* (2nd edn, London, 1987), p. 384; S. Bendall and P.J. Donald, *The Later Palaeologan Coinage* (London, 1979), pp. 153, 169.
53. Nicol, *Last Centuries*, p. 288.
54. S. Kugeas, 'Notizbuch eines beamten der Metropolis in Thessalonike', *BZ* 23 (1914–20), 143–63, at 148; Papazoglou, 'Η πολιορκία της Θεσσαλονίκης', 56, note 38a.
55. Peter Schreiner, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, CFHB 12, 3 vols (Vienna, 1975–7), i. 186.
56. Papazoglou, 'Η πολιορκία της Θεσσαλονίκης', 57; Melville-Jones, *Venice and Thessalonica: The Venetian Documents*, pp. 59–111; Giannis Tsiaras, 'Η Θεσσαλονίκη από τους Βυζαντινούς στους Βενετσιάνους (1423–1430)', *M* 17 (1977), 85–123.
57. Nicol, *Last Centuries*, pp. 347–50; Vakalopoulos, *Ιστορία της Θεσσαλονίκης*, p. 185; Speros Vryonis, 'The Ottoman conquest of Thessaloniki in 1430', in *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early*

Ottoman Society, ed. Anthony Bryer and Heath Lowry (Birmingham, 1986), pp. 281–321.

58. On the Zealot revolt see: Nicol, *Last Centuries*, pp. 194–5; Klaus-Peter Matschke, *Fortschritt und Reaktion in Byzanz im 14. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1971), pp. 175–86; Daphne Papadatou, 'Political associations in the late Byzantine period: the Zealots and sailors of Thessalonica', *Balkan Studies* 28 (1987), 3–23.
59. Nevra Necipoglu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins: A Study of Political Attitudes in the Late Palaiologan Period, 1370–1460* (Ann Arbor MI, 1990), pp. 64–70; Alan Harvey, 'Economic conditions in Thessaloniki between the two Ottoman occupations', in *Mediterranean Urban Culture, 1400–1700*, ed. Alexander Cowan (Exeter, 2000), pp. 115–24, at 123–4.
60. George Hoffman calls the Zealots 'the Democratic Party', giving a more temperate view on those slightly unknown radicals who are often presented as villains. As what we know about them comes from sources all hostile to them, such a picture is easy to be painted, so this remark reveals a more dispassionate view. George Hoffman, 'Thessaloniki: the impact of a changing hinterland', *East European Quarterly* 2 (1968), 1–27, at 15.
61. For more on this see Angeliki E. Laiou, 'Economic concerns and attitudes of the intellectuals of Thessalonike', *DOP* 57 (2003), 205–223.
62. George T. Dennis, 'The late Byzantine metropolitans of Thessalonike', *DOP* 57 (2003), 255–64, at 258; Vakalopoulos, *Ιστορία της Θεσσαλονίκης*, pp. 159–60.
63. Nicol, *Last Centuries*, pp. 292–3; Barker, *Manuel II*, pp. xxiii, 71–4. Georgios Kolias, 'Η ανταρσία Ιωάννου Ζ΄ εναντίον Ιωάννου Ε΄ Παλαιολόγου (1390)', *Hellenika* 12 (1952), 34–64.
64. Barker, *Manuel II*, p. 200.
65. Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, ed. I. Bekker, CSHB (Bonn 1834), p. 54.
66. Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, p. 55.
67. Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, p. 56.
68. Nicol, *Last Centuries*, pp. 312–13, Barker, *Manuel II*, pp. 164, 215–18.
69. Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, p. 78: 'καὶ ὁ ἀνεψιὸς αὐτοῦ παραχωρεῖ τῶν οἰάκων τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Λήμνῳ πέμπεται, καὶ ὁ Μανουὴλ μόνος βασιλεὺς παρὰ τοῦ παλατίου καὶ τοῦ δήμου εὐφημίζεται' [and his nephew submits the handgrips of the helm of kingship, and he himself is sent to the island of Lemnos, and Manuel is cheered as the only basileus by the palace and by the people].
70. George T. Dennis, 'The Byzantine Turkish treaty of 1403', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 33 (1967), 72–88, at 77 and reprinted in George T. Dennis, *Byzantium and the Franks* (London, 1982), No. VI.
71. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα Ἁγίου Δημητρίου)', *Politico-Historical Works*, ed. David Balfour (Vienna, 1979), pp. 39–69, at 48; Nicolas Oikonomides, 'John VII Palaeologus and the ivory pyxis at Dumbarton Oaks', *DOP* 31 (1977), 329–37, at 335.

72. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα ἁΑγίου Δημητρίου)', p. 45. According to Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, p. 119, Manuel II refers to a similar adoption of Sultan Mehmed I in a letter: «ἐγὼ μέν, ὡς οἶδας ἀκριβῶς, ὑπεσχέθην τοῦ εἶναί με πατὴρ εἰς σέ, σὺ δὲ υἱὸς εἰς ἐμέ. καὶ εἰ μὲν ἀμφότεροι φυλάξομεν τὰ ὑποσχεθέντα, ἰδοὺ καὶ φόβος θεοῦ καὶ τήρησις ἐντολῶν· εἰ δὲ παρεκβῶμεν αὐτά, ἰδοὺ ὁ πατὴρ ὡς προδότης υἱοῦ φανεῖται καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὡς πατρὸς φονεὺς κληθήσεται. (…)» [and I, as you know full well, I have pledged to be a father to you, and yourself a son to me. And if we both keep what has been promised, there will be fear of God and the observance of the commandments; but if we trespass these, here the father will appear as the betrayer of the son, and the son will be called the murderer of the father (…)].
73. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα ἁΑγίου Δημητρίου)', p. 45.
74. Manuel II Palaiologos, *Letters*, ed. George T. Dennis, CFHB (Washington DC, 1977), pp. 130–1; idem, *Dialogue with the Empress-Mother on Marriage*, ed. and trans. Athanasios Angelou (Vienna, 1991), pp. 98–100.
75. Schreiner, *Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, i. 98: 1408/6917 (Ind. 2) Sept 22 (…) ἐκοιμήθη βασιλεὺς Ἰωάννης εἰς τὴν Θεσσαλονίκην, κυροῦ Ἀνδρονίκου υἱός, σχηματιστεὶς Ἰωάσαφ. [… (…) the basileus John passed away in Thessalonica, the son of kyr Andronikos, having been named monk Joseph].
76. For a very clear discussion of these complicated ecclesiastical matters see: Norman Russell, 'Theosis and Gregory Palamas: continuity or doctrinal change?' *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 50 (2006), 357–79; idem, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 304–11.
77. Nicol, 'Thessalonica as a cultural centre', p. 131; Tinnefeld, 'Intellectuals', 154–5.
78. Vassileios Laourdas, 'Η κλασσική φιλολογία εις την Θεσσαλονίκην κατά τον δέκατον τέταρτον αιώνα', *EMS* 37 (1947), 5–23, 11.
79. Laourdas, 'Η κλασσική φιλολογία εις την Θεσσαλονίκην', 11; Donald M. Nicol, 'The Byzantine Church and Hellenic learning in the fourteenth century', in Donald M. Nicol, *Byzantium: its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World*, (London, 1972), No. XII; Norman Russell, 'Palamism and the circle of Demetrius Cydones', *Porphyrogenita, Essays in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, ed. C. Dendrinos, J. Harris, E. Harvalia-Crook, J. Herrin (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 153–74, at 154.
80. For some mapping out of the hesychast and anti-hesychast camps, the reader may refer to John Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, trans. George Lawrence (Crestwood NY, 1998), pp. 42–62.
81. Gerstel, 'Civic and monastic influences', 229.
82. Manuel II, *Letters*, pp. 18–19; Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα ἁΑγίου Δημητρίου)', pp. 138–9, 180–1.

83. *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, trans. Rosalind Hill (Oxford, 1962), p. 69.
84. Antonios Papadopoulos, *Ο άγιος Δημήτριος εις την Ελληνικήν και Βουλγαρικήν παράδοσιν,* (Thessalonica, 1971), p. 90.
85. Papadopoulos, *Ο άγιος Δημήτριος*, p. 99.

Chapter One

1. Hans-Georg Beck, *Theodoros Metochites: die Krise des byzantinischen Weltbildes im 14. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1952), pp. 1–25; Steven Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 62–6; Ihor Sevcenko, 'Theodore Metochites, the Chora, and the intellectual trends of his time', in *The Kariye Djami*, ed. Paul A. Underwood, 4 vols (Princeton NJ, 1968–75), iv. 19–91; idem, 'The Palaeologan Renaissance', in *Renaissances before the Renaissance: Cultural Revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. Warren Treadgold (Stanford CA, 1984), pp. 144–71, at 148–9; N.G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (2nd edn, London, 1996), pp. 256–64; *PLP* 17982.
2. Theodore Metochites, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια εἰς τὸν Ἅγιον Δημήτριον', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *M* 4 (1955–60), 56–82, at 57, 126, 131.
3. R. Guilland, *Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras: l'homme et l'oeuvre* (Paris, 1926); Theresa Hart, 'Nicephorus Gregoras: historian of the Hesychast controversy', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 2 (1951), 169–79; Runciman, *Last Byzantine Renaissance*, pp. 67–71; Demetrius Moschos, *Πλατωνισμός ή Χριστιανισμός: Οι φιλοσοφικές προϋποθέσεις του Αντιησυχασμού του Νικηφόρου Γρηγορά* (Athens, 1998); *PLP* 4443.
4. Nikephoros Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια εἰς τὸν Ἅγιον Δημήτριον', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *M* 4 (1955–60), 83–96, at 135; Vassilis Katsaros and Petros Vlachakos, *Ἅγιος Δημήτριος, Εγκωμιαστικοί Λόγοι Επιφανών Βυζαντινών Λογίων* (Thessalonica, 2004), pp. 194–6.
5. Meyendorff, *Study of Gregory Palamas*, pp. 42–85; R.E. Sinkewicz, 'Gregory Palamas', in *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition (13–19 siècle)*, ed. C.G. Conticello and V. Conticello (Turnhout, 2002), pp. 131–88; *PLP* 21546.
6. Katsaros, and Vlachakos, *Ἅγιος Δημήτριος, Εγκωμιαστικοί Λόγοι,* p. 309.
7. Constantine Harmenopoulos, 'Tomus Contra Gregorium Palamam', in *Graecia Orthodoxa*, ed. Leon Allatius, 2 vols (Rome, 1652), i. 780–5.
8. Nikos Veis, 'Ἁρμενοπουλικά Ἀνάλεκτα', in *Τόμος Κωνσταντίνου Ἁρμενόπουλου. Ἐπί τῇ Ἑξακοσιετηρίδι τῆς Ἐξαβίβλου Αὐτοῦ*

(1345–1945) (Thessalonica, 1952), 345–528, at 364. On Harmenopoulos's involvement in the hesychast controversy in general, see ibid, 361–4.

9. Konstantinos Vavouskos, 'Το Εμπράγματον Δίκαιον εις την Εξάβιβλον του Αρμενόπουλου', *CTPE*, pp. 237–58; *PLP* 1347. Asterios Argyriou, *Macaire Makrès et la polémique contre l'Islam*, Studi e Testi 314 (Vatican City, 1986), pp. 3, 38 suggests that Harmenopoulos may later have become a monk and been the spiritual father of the abbot of Pantokrator, Makarios Makris. This is, however, unconvincing because it would require Harmenopoulos still to have been alive in about 1410.
10. Norman Russell, 'Prochoros Cydones and the fourteenth-century understanding of Orthodoxy', in *Byzantine Orthodoxies*, ed. Andrew Louth and Augustine Casiday (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 75–91; *PLP* 11917.
11. Laourdas in Kokkinos, 'Φιλοθέου, Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως', 581.
12. P. Enepekides, 'Der Briefwechsel des Mystikers Nikolaos Kabasilas', *BZ* 46 (1953), 29–45. For the lack of biographical information on Kavasilas see Athanasios Angelopoulos, 'Νικόλαος Καβάσιλας ο Χαμαετός. Βιογραφικά προβλήματα', *PThS*, pp. 29–66.
13. For details on Kavasilas and the family of Chamaëtos see Athanasios Angelopoulos, *Νικόλαος Καβάσιλας Χαμαετός και το έργο αυτού* (Thessalonica, 1970); Athanasios Angelopoulos, 'Τὸ γενεαλογικὸν δένδρον τῆς οἰκογενείας τῶν Καβασιλῶν', *M* 17 (1977), 367–95; Myrrha Lot-Borodine, *Un maître de la spiritualité byzantine au XIVe siècle: Nicolas Cabasilas* (Paris, 1958); Manuel II, *Letters*, pp. xxx–xxxiv; Runciman, *Last Byzantine Renaissance*, pp. 20–1, 71–3; C.N. Tsirpanlis, 'The career and writings of Nicolas Cabasilas', *Byzantion* 49 (1979), 414–27; *PLP* 10102. For an extensive bibliography on Kavasilas, see Paul Chr. Mantovanis, 'The Eucharistic theology of Nicolas Cabasilas', University of Oxford, DPhil (1984).
14. There is a debate amongst Greek theologians on whether Kavasilas was a layman or not. See Theodoros N. Zeses, 'Το θεολογικόν έργον του Θεσσαλονικέως Αρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης Νείλου Καβάσιλα', *CTPE*, pp. 89–109, at 104. It appears that the world name of Neilos was also Nicholas, and Zeses is keen to feed that fact into the argument as well. See Zeses, 'Το θεολογικόν έργον του Νείλου Καβάσιλα', where he claims that early works of Neilos may have been attributed to Nicholas, thus enhancing the latter's reputation.
15. On Kavasilas's works, see *Explication de la Divine Liturgie*, introduction and ed. Sévérien Salaville, Sources Chrétiennes 4 (Paris, 1967); *De Vita in Christo, PG* 150. 493–726; 'Le traité inédit "Sur L'usure" de Nicolas Cabasilas', ed. Rodolphe Guilland, in *Εἰς Μνήμην Σπυρίδωνος Λάμπρου* (Athens, 1935), pp. 269–77; George T. Dennis, 'Nicholas Cabasilas Chamaëtos and his discourse on abuses committed by authorities against sacred things', *Byzantine Studies/Études Byzantines* 5 (1978), 80–7 and reprinted in George T. Dennis,

Byzantium and the Franks 1350–1420 (London, 1982), no. XI; as well as Mantovanis mentioned above.

16. Nicholas Kavasilas, 'Προσφώνημα εἰς τὸν ἔνδοξον τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεγαλομάρτυρα Δημήτριον τὸν Μυροβλύτην', *Mnemeia hagiologika*, ed. Theophilos Joannou (Venice, 1884), pp. 67–114; Nicholas Kavasilas, 'Νικολάου Καβάσιλα, Προσφώνημα καὶ Ἐπιγράμματα εἰς Ἅγιον Δημήτριον', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *EEBS* 22 (1952), 97–109, at 108.
17. Nicholas Kavasilas, 'Εἰς τὸν πανάγιον Δημήτριον καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ θαύματα' in *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα, Επτά Ανέκδοτοι Λόγοι το πρώτον νυν εκδιδόμενοι,* ed. Vassileios Pseutongás (Thessalonica, 1976), pp. 135–42.
18. R.-J. Loenertz, 'Isidore Glabas, métropolite de Thessalonique (1380–1396)', *REB* 6 (1948), 181–90; George T. Dennis, 'The late Byzantine metropolitans of Thessalonike', *DOP* 57 (2003), 254–64, at 257–9; Apostolos E. Vakalopoulos, 'Οι Δημοσιευμένες Ομιλίες του Αρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης Ισιδώρου ως Ιστορική Πηγή για τη Γνώση της Πρώτης Τουρκοκρατίας στη Θεσσαλονίκη (1387–1403)', *M* 4 (1955–60), 20–34; *PLP* 4223.
19. Laourdas in Isidore Glavas, 'Ἰσιδώρου ἀρχιεσκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης ὁμιλίαι εἰς τὰς ἑορτὰς τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *Hellenika Supplement* 5 (1954), 19–65, at 55, 60.
20. V. Laurent, 'Écrits spirituels inédits de Macaire Choumnos (c. 1382), fondateur de la "Néa Moni" à Thessalonique', *Hellenika* 14 (1955), 40–86; two items from which are translated in *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, vol. 4, pp. 1433–54; for Makarios Choumnos see also *PLP* 30956.
21. Makarios Choumnos, 'Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Δημήτριον', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *Gregorios Palamas* 38 (1955), 347–9, at 347.
22. These are three speeches and one letter which accompanied the second speech. They are entitled: I. 'Ὑποτύπωσις ἣν κατέλιπε τῇ ἀδελφότητι ὅτε πρῶτον ἀνῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν πολλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ πολλῶν βιασθείς'; II. 'Ἐπιστολὴ γραφεῖσα ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως καὶ σταλεῖσα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μετὰ τῆς ὑποτεταγμένης μονῳδίας'; III. 'Μονῳδία ἐπὶ Γρηγορίῳ καὶ Ἀκακίῳ ἐκδημήσασιν, ὅτε τὸ πρῶτον εἰς τὴν τῶν πόλεων ἀπεδήμησε βασιλεύουσαν'; IV. '<Ἐπιτελεύτιος ὁμιλία>'. See Laurent, 'Écrits spirituels inédits de Macaire Choumnos', 76–85.
23. V. Laurent, 'Le métropolite Gabriel (1397–1416/19) et le couvent de la Nea Moni', *Hellenika* 13 (1954), 241–55, at 242–52; Dennis, 'Late Byzantine metropolitans', 259–60; *PLP* 3416.
24. See Gabriel of Thessalonica, 'Ὁμιλίαι', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *Athina* 57 (1953), 142–73, at 150–5.
25. Gabriel of Thessalonica, 'Ὁμιλίαι', 142–9.
26. Demetrius Chrysoloras, 'Comparatio Veterum Imperatorum et nunc Imperatoris Manuelis Palaeologi', in Spyridon P. Lambros, *Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά*, 4 vols (Athens 1912–30), iii. 222–45; idem, 'Action de grâces de Démétrius Chrysoloras à la Théotokos pour l'anniversaire de la bataille

d'Ankara (28 Juillet 1403)', ed. Paul Gautier, *REB* 19 (1961), 348–56; Manuel, *Letters*, pp. xxxiv–xxxv.

27. See Vitalien Laurent, 'Le trisépiscopat du patriarche Matthieu Ier, 1397–1410. Un grand procès canonique à Byzance au début du XVe siècle', *REB* 30 (1972), 5–166, at 134: Demetrius Chrysoloras is mentioned as being present at 136: 'ὁ περιπόθητος θεῖος τοῦ βασιλέως κῦρ Θεόδωρος Παλαιολόγος ὁ Καντακουζηνός' [the beloved uncle of the basileus kyr Theodore Palaiologos Kantakouzenos] gives a speech, and then Demetrius Chrysoloras speaks up in his support: 'Συνῳδὰ τούτῳ καὶ ὁ οἰκεῖος τῷ θειοτάτῳ ἡμῶν αὐθέντη καὶ βασιλεῖ κῦρ Δημήτριος ὁ Χρυσολωρᾶς περὶ εἰρήνης αὐτῶν καὶ καταλλαγῆς διηλέχθη πρὸς πειθῶ συνείρας τοσαῦτα, ἃ καὶ λίθον ἐμάλαξαν ἄν' [And with him sung along also the intimate friend of our most divine master and basileus, kyr Demetrius Chrysoloras, and he spoke to them with the purpose of persuasion, of peace and of reconciliation, bringing together such things that would even soften a stone]. George T. Dennis in Manuel II, *Letters*, p. xxxv, translates these words as 'would make a stone shed tears'.
28. John Chortasmenos, *Johannes Chortasmenos. Briefe, Gedichte, kleine Schriften*, ed. Herbert Hunger, Wiener Byzantinistische Studien 7 (Vienna, 1969), pp. 171–3, 225.
29. Demetrius Chrysoloras, 'Τοῦ λογιωτάτου κυροῦ Δημητρίου τοῦ Χρυσολωρᾶ, Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον καὶ εἰς τὰ μύρα', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *Gregorios Palamas* 40 (1957), 342–53.
30. See John Anagnostes, *De Extremo Thessalonicensi Excidio Narratio*, ed. Barthold Georg Niebuhr, CHSB (Bonn, 1838), pp. 487–9; Balfour in Symeon of Thessalonica, *Politico-Historical Works*, pp. 158–9; Dennis, 'Late Byzantine metropolitans', 260–1; *PLP* 27057.
31. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Homilia Festalis in Sanctum Demetrium', in Symeon Archbishop of Thessalonica, *Ἔργα Θεολογικὰ*, ed. David Balfour, Analekta Vlatadon (Thessalonica, 1981), pp. 185–94.
32. Balfour, in Symeon of Thessalonica, *Politico-Historical Works*, p. 101.
33. See Symeon of Thessalonica, *Τα Λειτουργικά Συγγράμματα*, ed. Ioannis Phountoules (Thessalonica, 1968).
34. Joseph Gill, 'George Scholarius', in Joseph Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence and other Essays* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 79–94; C.J.G. Turner, 'The career of Georgios Gennadios Scholarios', *Byzantion* 39 (1969), 420–55; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, pp. 1–2; Theodoros N. Zeses, *Γεννάδιος Β΄Σχολάριος. Βίος-Συγγράμματα-Διδασκαλία* (Thessalonica, 1980); *PLP* 27304.
35. *Oeuvres complétes de Georges Scholarios*, Louis Petit, X.A. Siderides and Martin Jugie, 8 vols (Paris, 1928–35), i., p. xlvii; Zeses, *Γεννάδιος Β΄Σχολάριος*, p. 347. On Scholarios see also: Marie-Hélène Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400–vers 1472): un intellectuel face à la*

disparition de l'empire byzantin, Institut Français d'Etudes Byzantines (Paris, 2008).

36. Balfour calls Symeon's style limpid. Balfour, in Symeon of Thessalonica, *Politico-Historical Works*, p. 163.
37. Philotheos Kokkinos, 'Φιλοθέου, Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Δημήτριον', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *M* 2 (1941–52), 556–82, at 33–4; Plutarch, *Alexander* 5. Cf. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 84–5. On Kokkinos's education, see Nicol, 'Thessalonica as a Cultural Centre', p. 126.
38. A.R. Littlewood, 'Literature', in *Palgrave Advances: Byzantine History*, ed. Jonathan Harris (New York, 2005), pp. 133–46; C.N. Constantinides, *Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries (1204–ca.1310)* (Nicosia, 1982), pp. 1–2.
39. See for example the fairly disparaging comments in the well-known article by Cyril Mango, 'Byzantine literature as a distorting mirror' (Inaugural lecture, University of Oxford, May 1974) in Cyril Mango, *Byzantium and its image* (London, 1984), No. II, pp. 3–18; Romilly Jenkins, 'The Hellenistic origins of Byzantine education', *DOP* 17 (1963), 39–52.
40. *Rhetoric in Byzantium. Papers from the Thirty-Fifth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Exeter College, University of Oxford, March 2001*, ed. E.M. Jeffreys (Aldershot, 2003).
41. Averil M. Cameron, *Procopius and the Sixth Century* (London, 1985), pp. 40–3; Timothy Miller, 'The plague in John VI Cantacuzenus and Thucydides', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 17 (1976), 385–95.
42. George Kustas, 'The function and evolution of Byzantine rhetoric', *Viator* 1 (1970), 55–73, at 58, 65.
43. See, for example, K. Oehler, 'Aristotle in Byzantium', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 5 (1964), 133–46; Roger Scott, 'The classical tradition in Byzantine historiography', *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*, ed. Margaret Mullett and Roger Scott (Birmingham, 1981), pp. 61–74; P.E. Easterling, 'Sophocles and the Byzantine student', in *Porphyrogenita: Essays on Byzantine History and Culture and the Latin East Presented to Julian Chrysostomides*, ed. Charalambos Dendrinos, Jonathan Harris, Eirene Harvalia-Crook and Judith Herrin (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 319–34.
44. Robert Browning, 'Homer in Byzantium', *Viator* 6 (1975), 15–33; idem, 'The Byzantines and Homer', in *Homer's Ancient Readers: the Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes*, ed. Robert Lamberton and John J. Keaney (Princeton NJ, 1992), pp. 134–48.
45. Agne Vasilikopoulou-Ioannidou, *Ἡ ἀναγέννησις τῶν γραμμάτων κατὰ τὸν ιβ' αἰῶνα εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον καὶ ὁ Ὅμηρος* (Athens, 1971–2).
46. Browning, 'Homer in Byzantium', 29; Constantinides, *Higher Education in Byzantium*, pp. 103–8, 116–28.

47. *L'Achilléide byzantine*, ed. D.C. Hesseling (Amsterdam, 1919), pp. 75–6; also see *The Oxford Version of the Achilleid*, ed. Ole L. Smith (Copenhagen, 1990); Homer, *Iliad*, 6. 429–30, Browning, 'Homer in Byzantium', 30.
48. Kokkinos, 'Encomium Gregorii Palamae', pp. 437–8.
49. Xenophon, *Scripta Minora,* ed. G.W. Bowersock, 7 vols (Cambridge MA and London, 1984), vii.60.
50. Palamas, 'Ὁμιλία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις μεγαλομάρτυρα', p. 45.
51. Ibid., p. 56.
52. Sophocles, *Ajax,* 443.
53. Herodotus 2.116.3. One of the three quotations that Herodotus chooses to support his point (that Homer knew the legend of Helen and Proteus) comes from Book Six of the *Iliad*, and a little earlier than the episode we discussed above. Hector's mother Hecuba has just left him at the walls and went indoors to choose a robe as an offering to goddess Athena. This robe was chosen from those that Paris brought back from the same trip when he found Helen. Homer, *Iliad* 6. 289 onwards.
54. Plato, *Laws*, 942d.
55. Appian, *The Foreign Wars*, 9. 66.
56. Claudius Galen, *Opera Omnia*, ed. C.G. Kühn, 20 vols (Hildesheim, 1965), xiv, containing *De antidotis lib.II*, *De theriaca ad Pison*, *De theriaca ad Pamphil*., all of which refer to the same subject.
57. Palamas, 'Ὁμιλία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις μεγαλομάρτυρα', p. 59.
58. Metochites, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', p. 60.
59. Plato, *Euthydemus*, 298c.
60. Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 760.
61. Metochites, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμιαώ, 61.
62. Ibid., 66.
63. Xenophon, *Cyropaideia*, 6.3.11.
64. Homer, *Iliad*, 5. 191.
65. Metochites, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 72.
66. Sophocles, *Antigone*, 1030.
67. Metochites, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 78.
68. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 84.
69. Ibid., 84–5.
70. Ibid., 95–6.
71. Ibid., 84.
72. Ibid., 91–2.
73. Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 18. 1.
74. Euripides, Iphigenia in Aulis, 527.
75. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1159a.
76. Demosthenes, *Against Meidias*, 21. 159.
77. Plutarch, *Crassus*, 3.
78. Demosthenes, *On the Crown*, 18. 257.

79. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 84.
80. Pindar, *Nemean Odes*, 3. 2.
81. Thucydides, 3.56.2 , 3.65.1 and 5.54.
82. Appian, *The Civil Wars*, 5.13.130
83. Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 226.
84. Plutarch, *Amatoriae Narrationes*, 771.
85. Plato, *Laws*, 6. 774.
86. Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis*, 719.
87. Theophrastus, *De Causis Plantarum*, 3.16.2.
88. Theophrastus, *De Causis Plantarum*, 3.14.5.
89. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 89.
90. Herodotus, 5. 101; Plato, *Laws*, 708d; Isocrates, 8. 44.
91. Plutarch, *Phocion*, 22. 3–4.
92. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 91.
93. Arrian, 5.17.1.
94. Gregoras. 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 91.
95. Homer, *Iliad*, 10. 256.
96. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 92.
97. Homer, *Iliad*, 1. 1–7.
98. Sophocles, *Antigone*, 27.
99. Sophocles, *Antigone*, 67–8.
100. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 92.
101. Ibid., 95.
102. Herodotus, 9. 12; Plato, *Protagoras*, 335e; Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, 6.16.5; Diodorus of Sicily, *Library* 15.82.6.
103. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 90.
104. Pindar, *Olympian Odes*, 3. 38; *Pythian Odes*, 9. 80; *Isthmian Odes*, 1. 17.
105. Sophocles, *Electra*, 731–760.
106. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 96.
107. *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284–813*, trans. Cyril Mango and Roger Scott (Oxford, 1997), p. 481.
108. Constantine Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου εις την Προεόρτιον Εορτήν του Αγίου Δημητρίου', ed. Demetrius Gines, *EEBS* 21 (1951), 145–62, at 151.
109. Seneca, *Ad Polybium de Consolatione*, 1.
110. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 151–2.
111. Plato, *Charmides*, 3. 77.
112. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 154.
113. Ibid., 153.
114. Plato, *Apology*, 36d.
115. Plato, *Protagoras*, 337d; Gregoras, *Byzantina Historia*, ii. 678.
116. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 161.

117. Ibid., 153.
118. Ibid., 153.
119. Ibid., 153.
120. Ibid., 158.
121. Ibid., 160.
122. Plutarch, *Ethics*, 462b.
123. Romans, 12. 19
124. Kavasilas, 'Προσφώνημα εἰς τὸν ἔνδοξον τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεγαλομάρτυρα', 68, 93.
125. Kavasilas, 'Προσφώνημα καὶ Ἐπιγράμματα εἰς Ἅγιον Δημήτριον', 100.
126. Kavasilas, 'Εἰς τὸν πανάγιον Δημήτριον καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ θαύματα', e.g. pp. 135, 136, 137.
127. Ibid., p. 138.
128. Ibid., pp. 135–6.
129. Kavasilas refers to St Nestor in his earlier two encomia and not to St Loupos: Kavasilas, 'Προσφώνημα καὶ Ἐπιγράμματα εἰς Ἅγιον Δημήτριον', 104.
130. Ibid., 100.
131. Laourdas, in Chrysoloras, 'Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον', 351, 354.
132. Chrysoloras, 'Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον', 344.
133. Ibid., 343.
134. Ibid., 350–1.
135. On the sea metaphor, see George T. Dennis, 'The perils of the deep', *Novum Millennium: Studies on Byzantine History and Culture Dedicated to Paul Speck*, ed. Claudia Sode and Sarolta Takács (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 81–88.
136. Chrysoloras, 'Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον', 348.
137. Ibid., 344.
138. St Demetrius uses the same word in his reply: γνωστὸν ἔστω σοι ὡς οἱ θεοί σου καὶ αἱ θεαί, οὓς νῦν εὐφημουμένους ἐξεῖπας, καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ ἡ τούτων γέννησις καὶ πολιτεία καὶ τἄλλα πάντα, γέλως καὶ μανία σαφὴς καὶ οἱ πιστεύοντες αὐτοῖς ὄντως μαίνονται· πῶς γὰρ δύναται πλῆθος τοσοῦτον θεῶν συνίστασθαι καὶ ταῦτα περὶ ἀρχῆς καὶ πρωτείων καὶ ἔρωτος καὶ ἄλλων ἀτόπων ἄλλος ἄλλῳ μαχόμενος; [Let this be made known to you, that your gods and goddesses, whom you picked out as being exalted, both they themselves and their birth and history and all the other things to do with them, are laughable, and a clear frenzy, and those who believe in them really are out of their heads; how, in any case, can a plethora of such gods be in existence and how can these other things hold, about authority, and priority in hierarchy, and love, and all the other absurd things, like one of the gods fighting another?]; οὐ μανιώδης ἡ τούτων ἅπασα δόξα; οὐκ ἐρυθριᾷς αὐτοῖς σεμνυνόμενος; [Isn't the entire doctrine of them a form of frantic madness? Do you not become red with shame for worshipping them?], Chrysoloras, 'Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον', 347.
139. Ibid., 346.

140. Ibid., 345.
141. Ibid., 345. Further down the same expression is repeated more elaborately as: ‘Ὁ δὲ μέγας καὶ καλὸς ἀθλητὴς γενναίῳ καὶ λόγῳ καὶ βλέμματι καὶ νοΐ’ [And the great and good athlete being brave in word, and gaze, and mind], Chrysoloras, ‘Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον’, 346.
142. Ibid., 346.
143. Euphranor of Corinth (fl. 336 BC) was one of the few ancient artists who was celebrated for his ability both as a sculptor and as a painter. He is also the author of treatises on proportion and colour.
144. Polygnotus (fl. 463–431 BC) was famous for his painting of the Taking of Troy on the walls of the Stoa Poikile in Athens.
145. Roxana (d. 311 BC), daughter of Oxyartes the Bactrian, was the wife of Alexander the Great and mother of his son, Alexander Aegus.
146. Aetion (fl. 250 BC) was the author of the painting representing the marriage of Roxana and Alexander. The work was exhibited at the Olympic Games.
147. Pancaste of Larissa was the first mistress of Alexander the Great.
148. Apelles (c.370–c.310 BC) was a favourite painter of Alexander the Great.
149. The sculptor Praxiteles (fl. 360 BC) was the creator of the marble statue known as the Cnidian Aphrodite.
150. Alcamenes of Lemnos (fl. c.450 BC) was a younger contemporary of Phidias.
151. Calamis (fl. c. 450 BC) made the sculpture of Aphrodite Sosandra (savour of men) for the Acropolis in Athens.
152. Phidias (fl. c. 450 BC), the celebrated Athenian sculptor, one of whose works was the bronze Lemnian Athena which was commissioned by Athenians living on Lemnos for the Acropolis of Athens.
153. Lycinus is a protagonist in Lucian’s *Imagines* and is discussed more fully below.
154. Zeuxis of Heraclea (fl. 424–400 BC), a famous painter.
155. Parrhasius of Ephesus (fl. 424–400 BC) was a younger contemporary and rival of Zeuxis.
156. Chrysoloras, ‘Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον’, 346.
157. Chrysoloras, ‘Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον’, 347.
158. i.e. the planets Venus and Mercury.
159. Chrysoloras, ‘Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον’, 347.
160. Ibid., 347–8.
161. Ibid., 348.
162. Lucian of Samosata, *Essays in Portraiture*, in *Lucian, Volume IV*, ed. and trans. A.M. Harmon, (London and Cambridge MA, 1925), pp. 255–95.
163. Chrysoloras, ‘Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον’, 346.
164. Lucian, *Essays in Portraiture*, pp. 262–3.
165. Chrysoloras, ‘Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον’, 346.
166. Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 648–55; Manuel Chrysoloras, ‘Epistola ad Joannem Imperatorem’*, PG* 156, cols. 23–54, at 45–54; Cyril Mango, ‘Antique statuary and the Byzantine beholder’, *DOP* 17 (1963), 55–75, at 68, 70.

167. Lucian, *Essays in Portraiture*, pp. 276–7.
168. Chrysoloras, 'Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον', 347.
169. John Davis, 'Manuel II Palaeologus' *A Depiction of Spring in a Dyed, Woven Hanging*', in *Porphyrogenita: Essays on Byzantine History and Culture and the Latin East Presented to Julian Chrysostomides*, ed. Charalambos Dendrinos, Jonathan Harris, Eirene Harvalia-Crook and Judith Herrin (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 411–21, at 418.

Chapter Two

1. Speros Vryonis, 'The will of a provincial magnate, Eustathius Boilas', *DOP* 11 (1957), 263–77, at 269–70; Constantinides, *Higher Education in Byzantium*, pp. 138–9.
2. Isidore Glavas, ''Ομιλίαι εἰς τὰς ἑορτὰς τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου', 30. Cf. I Thessalonians, 3. 8 and 4. 4.
3. Isidore Glavas, ''Ομιλίαι εἰς τὰς ἑορτὰς τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου', 59 and 63; cf. Luke, 6. 27 and Matthew 5. 46.
4. Gabriel of Thessalonica, ''Ομιλίαι', 150–1.
5. I Corinthians 13. 1.
6. Gabriel of Thessalonica, ''Ομιλίαι', 150.
7. Ibid.; cf. I John 4. 16.
8. John 13. 34; Matthew 22. 36–8.
9. Gabriel of Thessalonica, ''Ομιλίαι', 151. Cf. John 13.34, 13.36, 14.15, 14.21, 15.10.
10. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Homilia Festalis in Sanctum Demetrium', p. 188; Isaiah 6. 3; Psalms 33. 5.
11. Romans, 6. 9.
12. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Homilia Festalis in Sanctum Demetrium', p. 189.
13. Ibid., p. 190; Philippians 3. 8; Psalms 144. 4.
14. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Homilia Festalis in Sanctum Demetrium', p. 190.
15. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα ἁγίου Δημητρίου)', p. 40; cf. I John 4. 19.
16. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα ἁγίου Δημητρίου)', p. 43; cf. II Corinthians 6. 15.
17. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα ἁγίου Δημητρίου)', p. 52; Song of Moses: Exodus 15. 1–19; Miriam's song: Exodus 15. 20–1.
18. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα ἁγίου Δημητρίου)', p. 46; see also pp. 44, 56.

19. Ibid., p. 64; cf. Psalms 29. 5: 'For his anger endureth but a moment; in his favour is life: weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning'.
20. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα Ἁγίου Δημητρίου)', p. 64; cf. Genesis, 42.19.
21. Palamas, 'Ὁμιλία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις μεγαλομάρτυρα', p. 48; Acts 9.15. Yet the same metaphor can be found in the first encomium of Symeon of Thessalonica, Homilia Festalis in Sanctum Demetrium', p. 187.
22. Palamas, 'Ὁμιλία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις μεγαλομάρτυρα', p. 46; Greek Psalter 91. 13, 51. 10; Psalms 1. 3.
23. Palamas, 'Ὁμιλία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις μεγαλομάρτυρα', pp. 46–7.
24. Metochites, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 57; cf. Jeremiah 10. 19: 'Woe is me for my hurt! My wound is grievous: but I said, Truly this is a grief, and I must bear it'.
25. Metochites, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 60; cf. Psalms 30. 9: 'What profit is there in my blood, when I go down the pit? Shall the dust praise thee? Shall it declare thy truth?'.
26. Metochites, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 72; cf. Luke 9. 62: 'And Jesus said unto him, No man having put his hand to the plough and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God'.
27. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 93; cf. Matthew 26. 7–13; Mark 14. 3–9; Luke 7. 37–50; John 12. 3–8.
28. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 152; Proverbs 9. 1.
29. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 155; cf. John 1. 14: 'And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us'.
30. Gabriel of Thessalonica, 'Ὁμιλίαι', 144, 166, 167.
31. Philotheos Kokkinos, 'Εγκώμιον εις Ἅγιον Μεγαλομάρτυρα Δημήτριον τον Μυροβλήτην', in *Ἁγιολογικὰ Ἔργα, Α΄ Θεσσαλονικεῖς Ἅγιοι*, ed. Demetrius Tsames (Thessalonica, 1985), pp. 33–60, e.g. at 37, 41, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 58.
32. Oscar Broneer, 'The Apostle Paul and the Isthmian Games', *The Biblical Archaeologist* 25 (1962), 2–31, at 29.
33. II Timothy 2. 5.
34. Hebrews 12. 1.
35. Philippians 3. 14; I Corinthians 9. 24.
36. On the early Church's move away from pacifism, see Despina Iosif, 'Caesar the warrior versus Jesus the peacemaker', *Eulimene* 9 (2003), 167–80.
37. John Chrysostom, 'In hoc Apostoli Dictum, Utinam Sustineretis Modicum quid Insipientiae Meae (2 Cor. 11.1)', *PG* 51. 301–10, at 301; idem, 'Sermo Admonitorius sub Initum Sanctae Quadragesimae, Homilia XI', *PG* 53. 90–8, *PG* 53. 90–8, at 95. In general, see Symeon Metaphrastes, 'Vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi', *PG* 114. 1045–1210, at 1101; Margaret M. Mitchell, 'The

Archetypal Image: John Chrysostom's Portraits of Paul', *The Journal of Religion* 75 (1995), 15–43.

38. John Chrysostom, 'Argumentum Epistolae Primae ad Corinthios, Homilia VI', *PG* 61. 47–54, at 47; idem, 'In Acta Apostolorum Homil. XXXI', *PG* 60. 227–34, at 230.
39. John Chrysostom, 'Commentarius in Acta Apostolorum Homilia XXXI', *PG* 60. 675–82, at 678; idem, 'In Secundam ad Corinthios Epistolam Commentarius, Homilia XXVI', *PG* 61. 569–610, at 573.
40. John Chrysostom, 'Ad Populum Antiochenum Habitae, Homilia III', *PG* 49. 47–60, at 51.
41. John Chrysostom, 'Laudatio Sancti Martyris Barlaam', *PG* 50. 675–82, at 682.
42. John Klimakos, *Κλῖμαξ*, ed. Archimandrite Ignatios (Oropos, Attica, 2002), pp. 52 (2.7). Cf. Matthew 8. 22.
43. The translation is that of Colm Luibheid and Norman Russell, *John Climacus: The Ladder of Divine Ascent* (London, 1982), p. 82.
44. Klimakos, *Κλῖμαξ*, pp. 41–2 (1.18). The divine fire that the monks are seeking here must have rung true to the followers of Palamas, and pursuers of the uncreated light.
45. Translation by Colm Luibheid and Norman Russell, p. 76.
46. Matthew 11. 28
47. Theodore of Studios, 'Laudatio S. Platonis Hegumeni', *PG* 99. 803–50, at 832.
48. Neophytos the Recluse, 'Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον καὶ ἔνδοξον μεγαλομάρτυρα Χριστοῦ Δημήτριον', ed. V. Laourdas, 'Βυζαντινὰ καὶ μεταβυζαντινὰ ἐγκώμια εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Δημήτριον', *M* 4 (1955–60), 49–55, at 52. Cf. John Chrysostom, 'Laudatio Sancti Martyris Barlaam', at 678: 'ὅ που γὰρ δεσμὰ τοιαῦτα, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς πάρεστιν' [wherever there are such restraints, there is also Christ being supportive].
49. *Gesta Francorum*, p. 29.
50. Gabriel of Thessalonica, 'Ὁμιλίαι', 157. Cf. II Timothy 2. 5: 'And if a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully'.
51. Gabriel of Thessalonica, 'Ὁμιλίαι', 157.
52. Makarios Choumnos, 'Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Δημήτριον', 348, 349.
53. Kavasilas, 'Προσφώνημα καὶ Ἐπιγράμματα εἰς Ἅγιον Δημήτριον', 104.
54. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 156, 159. Harmenopoulos also uses the expressions ἀριστεύς (excellent combatant) and καλλίνικος (beautiful victor). See 150, 158–9, 159, 160, 161. See also 'τῷ μεγάλῳ' [of the great (St Demetrius)], in Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 156.
55. George Scholarios, 'Fragmentum Panegyrici in Sanctum Demetrium', in *Oeuvres complétes de Georges Scholarios*, Louis Petit, X.A. Siderides and Martin Jugie, 8 vols (Paris, 1928–35), i. 238–46, at 238.
56. Ibid., p. 244.
57. Metochites, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 71.

58. Kokkinos, 'Encomium Gregorii Palamae', p. 590.
59. Philotheos Kokkinos, 'Vita Isidori Patriarchae', in *Ἁγιολογικὰ Ἔργα, Α' Θεσσαλονικεῖς Ἅγιοι*, ed. D. Tsames (Thessalonica, 1985), pp. 327–423, at 373; Mark Bartusis, Khalifa Ben Nasser and Angeliki E. Laiou, 'Days and deeds of a hesychast saint: a translation of the Greek life of Saint Romylos', *Byzantine Studies/Études Byzantines* 9 (1982), 24–47, at 31.
60. Kokkinos, 'Encomium Gregorii Palamae', p. 551.
61. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 88.
62. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 157, 161.
63. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Διδασκαλία πρὸς τὸν εὐσεβῆ δεσπότην κυρὸν Ἀνδρόνικον', *Politico-Historical Works*, ed. David Balfour (Vienna, 1979), pp. 78–82, at 78.
64. Palamas, 'Ὁμιλία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις μεγαλομάρτυρα', pp. 50, 60.
65. Kokkinos, 'Εγκώμιον εις Ἅγιον Μεγαλομάρτυρα Δημήτριον', p. 36.
66. Ibid., pp. 37–8.
67. Ibid., p. 57.
68. Ibid., p. 57.
69. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 154.
70. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 91.
71. Ibid., 91.
72. Ibid., 91.
73. Ibid., 90.
74. Chrysoloras, 'Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον', 343.
75. Ibid., 344.
76. Metochites, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 59.
77. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Homilia Festalis in Sanctum Demetrium', p. 187.
78. Kokkinos, 'Εγκώμιον εις Ἅγιον Μεγαλομάρτυρα Δημήτριον', 35.

Chapter Three

1. For a discussion of the panegyris see Vryonis, 'Panegyris of the Byzantine saint', 196–228; Gerstel, 'Civic and monastic influences', 229.
2. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 150.
3. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 89.
4. Ibid., 89.
5. Pseudo-Lucian, *Timarion*, p. 116.
6. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 88.
7. Ibid., 88.

8. Ibid., 88.
9. On his coming from another part of the world, Gregoras makes an extensive comment, from which for the purposes of this chapter I will just record a short excerpt: 'τὸν συνήθη (…) ἄλλως (…) με δρόμον ὁδεύοντα (…), μηδὲ κατὰ τῆς πατρίου πόλεως ἦθος τοῦ μάρτυρος, θαυμάζειν οὐ χρή· ἔστι γὰρ καὶ τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις ἤθεσι διὰ κόρον ἐνίοτε ἀχθομένους, ἥδιον τοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις κεχρῆσθαι διὰ τὸ σπάνιον, εἰ καὶ μὴ πρὸς τὴν ἁρμόττουσαν ἴσως εὐδοκίμησιν πάνυ τοι ἐπεφύκει' [one need not marvel at me taking a road different to the usual, not to the custom of the native city of the martyr; because sometimes, for being tired of the local customs because of over-use, it is agreeable to make use of the foreign (customs) for their rarity, even if perhaps this does not lead to the appropriate success], in Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 83–4. Such long passages with explanations of his thinking and his methods are characteristic of Gregoras's encomium.
10. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 85.
11. Ibid., 85.
12. The Byzantines thought of time as a cyclic structure, with the seasons in perpetual repetition rather than in linear progress.
13. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 90.
14. Ibid., 90.
15. J.K. Hyde, *Society and Politics in Medieval Italy. The Evolution of the Civil Life, 1000–1350* (London, 1973), pp. 60–1; Daniel Waley, *The Italian City-Republics* (3rd edn, Harlow, 1988), pp. 101–2. For a discussion of ekphraseis of cities in general see Saradi, 'Kallos of the Byzantine city', 37–56.
16. Gregoras shows his knowledge of ancient tragedy in many passages; see for example his reference to Orestes and Pylades, in Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 90, where he gives a beautiful and heightened view of the value of friendship, bringing Orestes and Pylades at the forefront of his thought.
17. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 160. Also at 158, 'τὸν χριστομίμητον (…) μάρτυρα' [the martyr who imitates Christ].
18. Ibid., 158.
19. Miklosich and Müller, Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi Sacra et Profana, i.175; Walter, Warrior Saints, pp. 81–2, n. 56.
20. Hetherington, Byzantine and Medieval Greece, p. 216.
21. Palamas, ''Ομιλία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις μεγαλομάρτυρα', p. 48. See Psalms, 1.1.
22. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 93. Cf. Matthew 26. 7–13; Mark 14. 3–9; Luke 7. 37–50; John 12. 3–8.
23. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 158.
24. Kokkinos, 'Εγκώμιον εις Άγιον Μεγαλομάρτυρα Δημήτριον', pp. 33–60.

25. John 15. 17–18.
26. Kokkinos, 'Εγκώμιον εις Άγιον Μεγαλομάρτυρα Δημήτριον', p. 35.
27. Ibid., p. 35.
28. Ibid., p. 36.
29. Ibid., p. 35. Cf. Ephesians 6. 12.
30. Ibid., p. 37. See I Peter 5. 1.
31. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 87–8.
32. Ibid., 87–8.
33. Ibid., 87.
34. Ibid., 84, 89.
35. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 161.
36. Περιφανής comes from the verb περιφαίνομαι, which means to be seen from all sides. It indicates by association something superior enough to be worthy of such exposure.
37. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 161.
38. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 92.
39. Bakirtzis, 'Pilgrimage to Thessalonike', 185.
40. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 92.
41. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'De Sacra Precatione', PG 155. 535–670, at 544. Cf. Matthew 17. l–2.
42. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'De Sacro Templo et ejus Consecratione', PG 155. 305–62, at 356.
43. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'De Sacro Templo', col. 321.
44. Bakirtzis, 'Pilgrimage to Thessalonike', 185, 192.
45. In Bakirtzis, 'Pilgrimage to Thessalonike', 185.
46. Chrysoloras, 'Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον', p. 343.
47. John Stavrakios, 'Ἰωάννου Σταυρακίου λόγος εἰς τὰ θαύματα τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου', ed. Ioakeim Iberites, M 1 (1940), 324–76, at 351.
48. Bakirtzis, 'Pilgrimage to Thessalonike', 185, 191.
49. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 88–9.
50. Ibid., 88–9.
51. One of these seems to have been attended by Emperor Alexios I Komnenos in 1106 or 1107: Comnena, Alexiade, iii. 66; trans. Sewter, p. 380.
52. Gregoras, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια', 89.
53. Stelios Pelekanides, *Παλαιοχριστιανικά Μνημεία Θεσσαλονίκης. Αχειροποίητος, Μονή Λατόμου* (Thessalonica, 1949), p. 12.
54. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 150.
55. Antonios Papadopoulos, 'Εγκώμια στον Άγιο Δημήτριο κατά την Παλαιολόγεια Εποχή και ο εορτασμός του αγίου στη Θεσσαλονίκη', *CTPE*, pp. 129–45.
56. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 152; Xyngopoulos, 'Αἱ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Ἀχειροποιήτου Θεσσαλονίκης εἰδήσεις', 11.

57. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 160. Also see Andreas Xyngopoulos, 'Καταφυγὴ-᾽Αχειροποίητος', *M* 4 (1955–60), 441–8.
58. Palamas, '῾Ομιλία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις μεγαλομάρτυρα', pp. 52–3.
59. Ibid., pp. 53–4.
60. Ibid., p. 53.
61. On this latter sense, see Peter Brown, 'The rise and function of the holy man in Late Antiquity', in Peter Brown, *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1982), pp. 103–52.
62. Pelekanides, *Παλαιοχριστιανικά Μνημεία*, p. 12.
63. Xyngopoulos, 'Καταφυγὴ-᾽Αχειροποίητος', 441–8.
64. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 158.
65. Otherwise known as the Akathist (meaning standing) to the Theotokos, the Greek name of Chairetismoi or Salutations refers to the opening word of every phrase ('χαῖρε') of each line of the main part of each verse (chorus). The akolouthia of Chairetismoi takes place the first four Fridays of Lent, and then the whole hymn is repeated on the fifth Friday. For a detailed study of the Akathist hymn see *The Akathistos Hymn*, ed. Egon Wellesz (Copenhagen, 1957).
66. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 151 onwards.
67. For details on the church and the Litany see Pelekanides, *Παλαιοχριστιανικά Μνημεία*, pp. 12, 35–41.
68. Symeon of Thessalonica (attributed), '᾽Ακριβὴς διάταξις τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *Gregorios Palamas* 39 (1956), 326–41. See Stelios Pelekanides, 'Παρατηρήσεις τινές εις Συμεών Θεσσαλονίκης "Διάταξις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ ῾Αγίου Δημητρίου"', *M* 4 (1955–60), 410–15, at 410.
69. Xyngopoulos, 'Καταφυγὴ-᾽Αχειροποίητος', 446, 448.
70. Harmenopoulos, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου', 151.
71. Ibid., 160.
72. Ibid., 151, 160.
73. Ibid., 150.
74. Ibid., 151.
75. Ibid., 151.
76. Ibid., 150.
77. Ibid., 151.
78. Palamas, '῾Ομιλία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις μεγαλομάρτυρα', p. 52.
79. Isidore Glavas, '῾Ομιλίαι εἰς τὰς ἑορτὰς τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου', 32–43, containing the second encomium of Isidore, which was dedicated to the monks of Thessalonica and is entitled: 'Τοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὁμιλία ρηθεῖσα εἰς τρίτην μετὰ τὴν μνήμην τοῦ ῾Αγιου Δημητρίου, καθ᾽ ἣν ἑορτάζουσιν οἱ μοναχοί' [Of the same (author), speech said on the third (day) after the memory of Saint Demetrius, on which the monks celebrate].

80. Symeon of Thessalonica (attributed), ‘Ἀκριβὴς διάταξις τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου’, 329.
81. Gregoras, ‘Βυζαντινὰ καὶ Μεταβυζαντινὰ Ἐγκώμια’, 89.
82. On Choumnos see *PLP* 30956. On the Nea Moni, see Janin, *Églises et les monastères*, pp. 398–9; G.I. Theocharides, ‘Η Νέα Μονή Θεσσαλονίκης’, *M* 3 (1953–5), 334–52; idem, ‘Δύο Νέα Ἔγγραφα Αφορώντα εις την Νέαν Μονήν Θεσσαλονίκης’, *M* 4 (1955–60), 315–51.
83. Laourdas in Makarios Choumnos, ‘Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Δημήτριον’, 350.
84. Isidore Glavas, ‘Ὁμιλίαι εἰς τὰς ἑορτὰς τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου’, 32–43.
85. See the comment by Laourdas, ‘Βυζαντινὰ καὶ μεταβυζαντινὰ ἐγκώμια’, 126.
86. Makarios Choumnos, ‘Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Δημήτριον’, 347.
87. Ibid., 349.
88. Ibid., 349.
89. Ibid., 347. Cf. Mark 4. 39.
90. Makarios Choumnos, ‘Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Δημήτριον’, 347.
91. Scholarios, ‘Fragmentum Panegyrici’, p. 238.
92. Ibid., p. 244.
93. Isidore Glavas, ‘Ὁμιλίαι εἰς τὰς ἑορτὰς τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου’, 22.
94. Ibid., 19.
95. Ibid., 19.
96. Ibid., 21.

Chapter Four

1. Gabriel of Thessalonica, ‘Ὁμιλίαι’, 142–73.
2. Ibid., 164.
3. Ibid., 165. Cf. Jeremiah 3. 15: ‘And I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding’. Gabriel’s speeches draw upon the scriptures heavily and they use them in a creative, almost virtuosic, way to convey a Christian message with a relevance to contemporary reality. His understated tone is an asset to his work, as it gives him the ability to blend difficult concepts into a smooth, evenly paced speech.
4. Gabriel of Thessalonica, ‘Ὁμιλίαι’, 168.
5. Ibid., 146.
6. Galatians 4. 26.
7. Palamas, ‘Ὁμιλία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις μεγαλομάρτυρα’, pp. 56–7.

8. Demetrius Chrysoloras, 'Demetrio Crisoloras el Palaciego, Encomio de la pulga', ed. G. de Andrés, *Helmantica* 35 (1984), 51–69. On Chrysoloras as mesazon, see Jean Verpeaux, 'Contribution à l'étude de l'administration byzantine: ὁ μεσάζων', *Byzantinoslavica* 16 (1955), 270–96, at 286–7; Chortasmenos, *Briefe*, p. 45; Manuel II, *Letters*, pp. 90–2. For the office of mesazon in general, see Verpeaux as above and Hans-Georg Beck, 'Der byzantinische "Ministerpräsident"', *BZ* 48 (1955), 309–38.
9. Sylvester Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, ed. and trans. V. Laurent, Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores 9 (Rome, 1971), pp. 172–4, 606.
10. Chrysoloras, 'Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον', 342–53.
11. Bakirtzis, 'Pilgrimage to Thessalonike', 185.
12. Laourdas in Chrysoloras, 'Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον', 348; Gautier in Chrysoloras, 'Action de grâces', 340.
13. Chrysoloras, 'Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον', 349.
14. Gouillard, 'Synodicon de l'Orthodoxie', 99; Oikonomides, 'John VII Palaeologus and the ivory pyxis', 335–6; Balfour, in Symeon of Thessalonica, *Politico-Historical Works*, p. 121.
15. Barker, *Manuel II*, p. 245; George T. Dennis, 'John VII Palaiologos: "A holy and just man"', in *Byzantium State and Society: In Memory of Nikos Oikonomides*, ed. Anna Avramea, Angeliki E. Laiou and Evangelos Chrysos (Athens, 2003), pp. 205–17.
16. *Ecthesis Chronica*, ed. S. Lambros (London, 1902), pp. 1–2.
17. Balfour, in Symeon of Thessalonica, *Politico-Historical Works*, pp. 150–3; Melville-Jones, *Venice and Thessalonica: Venetian Documents,* p. 206.
18. 'Μὴ κατεξανίστασθαι τῶν ἀρχόντων, ἀλλὰ τούτους ὡς ἐκ Θεοῦ προβληθέντες ἐδίδασκε στέργειν.' [Not to rise against the rulers but to accept them as brought forward by God; so he was instructing]. Anagnostes, *Narratio*, p. 8.
19. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Διδασκαλία πρὸς τὸν εὐσεβῆ δεσπότην κυρὸν Ἀνδρόνικον', p. 78.
20. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα Ἁγίου Δημητρίου)', p. 53.
21. Ibid., p. 53. Anagnostes, *Narratio*, p. 487 also calls him a shepherd but not a wretched one. He calls him a καλὸν ποιμένα [good shepherd], who imitated the first shepherd (πρῶτον ποιμένα), and who gave unsparingly and every time his soul for the good of his flock. The notion of Symeon striving to imitate Christ ties into Symeon's own theological work, where he expands his ideas extensively on topics such as the role of the clergy in the celebration of the liturgy and within the life of the church in general, and on the way Christ is typified during the Akolouthia by the celebrant priest.
22. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα Ἁγίου Δημητρίου)', p. 53.
23. Ibid., p. 54.

24. Interesting use of ἀπαγορεύω. The barrier here is not an external hindrance but one's own failing. Symeon's personal struggle with old age, frail health, ideological isolation, lack of support from Constantinople, and the desire for the preservation of the Orthodox rite and for his personal redemption is fleshed out in his writings and gives them the immediacy of the work that is written in difficult times. His strife for personal redemption and his desire for the redemption of every Christian is what ultimately drives his teaching and his actions. This message is pronounced directly in his advisory letter to the young Despot Andronikos.
25. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα ῾Αγίου Δημητρίου)', p. 54.
26. Ibid., p. 54.
27. Ibid., p. 56.
28. Ibid., p. 57.
29. Ibid., p. 57.
30. Ibid., p. 59.
31. Ibid., pp. 58–9.
32. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Συμβουλία ὁμοίως περὶ τοῦ ἵστασθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ κατὰ τῶν φρονούντων τὰ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐπιτίμησις', Politico-Historical Works, ed. David Balfour (Vienna, 1979), pp. 88–90, at 89.
33. Doukas, Historia Byzantina, p. 200.
34. Anagnostes, Narratio, p. 514.
35. Ibid., p. 525.
36. John Anagnostes, Pro Viribus Acta Monodia, ed. Barthold Georg Niebuhr, CHSB (Bonn, 1838), p. 533.
37. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα ῾Αγίου Δημητρίου)', p. 59.
38. Ibid., p. 60.
39. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Συμβουλία ὁμοίως περὶ τοῦ ἵστασθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ', p. 89.
40. Doukas, Historia Byzantina, p. 197. In return the citizens of Thessalonica undertook to be loyal to the Venetians: 'καὶ αὐτοὶ Θεσσαλονικαῖοι ἔστερξαν τοῦ εἶναι πιστοὶ ἐν τῇ κοινότητι τῶν Βενετικῶν, ὥσπερ αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἐν Βενετίᾳ καὶ γενηθέντας καὶ τραφέντας' [and the Thessalonians themselves agreed to be loyal to the community of the Venetians, exactly as those who were born and bred in Venice].
41. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Συμβουλία ὁμοίως περὶ τοῦ ἵστασθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ', p. 89.
42. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Συμβουλία καὶ εὐχὴ τοῖς ἱσταμένοις πιστῶς ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ τοῖς ἐναντίως ἔχουσιν ἐπιτίμησις', *Politico-Historical Works*, ed. David Balfour (Vienna, 1979), pp. 83–7, at 85. Cf. James 2. 20.

43. Doukas, Historia Byzantina, p. 200.
44. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Συμβουλία καὶ εὐχὴ τοῖς ἱσταμένοις πιστῶς', p. 84.
45. Ibid., p. 84.
46. Ibid., p. 84.
47. Ibid., p. 85.
48. Ibid., p. 85.
49. Melville-Jones, Venice and Thessalonica: The Venetian Documents, pp. 147–53.
50. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Συμβουλία καὶ εὐχὴ τοῖς ἱσταμένοις πιστῶς', p. 85.
51. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'De Sacris Ordinationibus', PG 155. 361–470, at 432.
52. Symeon of Thessalonica, 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα Ἁγίου Δημητρίου)', pp. 60–3.
53. Ibid., pp. 68–9.

Aftermath

1. Anagnostes, *Narratio,* pp. 514–5.
2. Michael J. Vickers, 'Cyriac of Ancona in Thessaloniki', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 2 (1976), 75–82, at 78.
3. Vickers, 'Cyriac of Ancona in Thessaloniki', 78;
4. Bakirtzis, 'Urban continuity', 50.
5. Xyngopoulos, 'Αἱ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Ἀχειροποιήτου Θεσσαλονίκης εἰδήσεις', 4.
6. Bertandon de la Broquière, *The Voyage d'Outremer,* trans. Galen R. Kline (New York, 1988), p. 89.
7. Bakirtzis, 'Pilgrimage to Thessalonike', 192.
8. Machiel Keil, 'Notes on some Turkish monuments in Thessaloniki', *Balkan Studies* 11 (1970), 122–56, at 125.
9. Dennis, 'Late Byzantine metropolitans', 261.
10. Vryonis, 'Panegyris of the Byzantine saint', pp. 217–26.
11. J. Darrouzès, 'Lettres de 1453', *REB* 22 (1964), 72–127, at 96–9.
12. Deno J. Geanakoplos, 'Theodore Gaza, a Byzantine scholar of the Palaeologan "renaissance" in the Italian Renaissance', in Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West* (Madison WI, 1989), pp. 68–90, at 69–72; Giuseppe Cammelli, 'Andronico Callisto'*, La Rinascità* 5 (1942), 104–21, 174–214; Gregorios D. Ziakas, 'Πνευματικός βίος και πολιτισμός της Θεσσαλονίκης κατά την περίοδο της Οθωμανικής κυριαρχίας', *Χριστιανική Θεσσαλονίκη, Οθωμανική Περίοδος 1430–1912, Β'*

(Thessalonica, 1994), pp. 90–165, at 113–17; Jonathan Harris, *Greek Émigrés in the West, 1400–1520* (Camberley, 1995), p. 17.

13. Ziakas, 'Πνευματικός βίος και πολιτισμός', pp. 113–17; Graham Speake, 'Janus Lascaris' visit to Mount Athos in 1491', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 34 (1993), 325–30.

Appendix

1. Laonikos Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum Libri Decem*, ed. I. Bekker, CSHB (Bonn, 1843), p. 235; Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, ed. I. Bekker, CHSB (Bonn, 1834), pp. 196–201; Georgius Sphrantzes, *Chronicon*, ed. Riccardo Maisano, CFHB (Rome, 1990), p. 68; John Anagnostes, *De extremo Thessalonicensi excidio narratio*, ed. Barthold Georg Niebuhr, CHSB (Bonn, 1838); John Anagnostes, *Pro viribus acta monodia*, ed. Barthold Georg Niebuhr, CHSB (Bonn, 1838).
2. Doukas, p. 197. In return the citizens of Thessalonica undertook to be loyal to the Venetians: 'καὶ αὐτοὶ Θεσσαλονικαῖοι ἔστερξαν τοῦ εἶναι πιστοὶ ἐν τῇ κοινότητι τῶν Βενετικῶν, ὥσπερ αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἐν Βενετίᾳ καὶ γενηθέντας καὶ τραφέντας' [and the Thessalonians themselves agreed to be loyal to the community of the Venetians, exactly as those who were born and bred in Venice]. Ibid..
3. Lambros argues that the letter was written in Greek; for reference see note 4.
4. Spyros Lambros, ''Η ἑλληνικὴ ὡς ἐπίσημος γλῶσσα τῶν σουλτάνων', *Neos Ellinomnemon* 5 (1908), 40–78, at 63–4.
5. Ibid., 64.
6. Sphrantzes, p. 68.
7. Ibid., p. 68.
8. Laonikos Chalkokondyles, pp. 235–6.
9. Ibid., p. 236.
10. Ibid., p. 235.
11. Doukas, p. 200.
12. Ibid., p. 200.
13. Ibid., p. 201.
14. Ibid., p. 200.
15. Anagnostes, *Narratio*, p. 518.
16. Ibid., pp. 514–15.
17. Ibid., p. 515.
18. Ibid., p. 515.
19. Ibid., pp. 515–16.

20. Ibid., p. 514.
21. Anagnostes, *Narratio*, p. 500.
22. St Demetrius figures prominently in the writings of Anagnostes. It is worth mentioning here that the local saint Theodora, who was also known for her myrrh, is also mentioned by him in his Narration: 'Ταύτην τὴν πονηρὰν ἐπεδείξαντο γνώμην καὶ περὶ τὸ τῆς ὁσίας καὶ μυροβλήτιδος Θεοδώρας ἱερώτατον λείψανον, ὃ καὶ ὡς ἐπιπολῆς κείμενον ἀπερρίφη τε κατὰ γῆς, ὢ τόλμης καὶ μιαρῶν χειρῶν, καὶ κατεθραύσθη εἰς μέρη' [They showed the same villanous mind also about the holy remnant of the myrovlyte Theodora, which as it was lying at the top it was thrown on the earth, o daring and polluted hands, and it got broken in places], in Anagnostes, *Narratio*, p. 516. The Thessalonian mystic and statesman Nicholas Kavasilas has written an encomium in honour of St Theodora: Nicholas Kavasilas, 'Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὴν Ὁσίαν Μητέρα ἡμῶν καὶ Μυροβλήτιδα Θεοδώραν', ed. Migne, J.P., Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca 150 (Paris, 1865), pp. 727–50.
23. Doukas, p. 200.
24. Doukas and Anagnostes both refer to this: 'ὁ δὲ ἡγεμὼν ἀθροίσας ἐκ τῶν πέριξ χωρίων καὶ πόλεων ἐγκατοίκους Τούρκους σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις κατέστησεν, κελεύσας, εἴ τις τῶν Ρωμαίων ἐξαγορασθείη καὶ ἐλευθερωθείη, ἐχέτω ἄδειαν τοῦ ἐλθεῖν καὶ οἰκῆσαι πάλιν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει.' [and the commander, after he gathered and brought from the surrounding villages and towns the Turkish inhabitants with their wives and children, he gave orders that if any of the Romans were to be ransomed and freed, they had permission to come and live again in this city], Doukas, pp. 200–1; 'πρότερον δὲ διὰ πάσης τῆς ὑπ᾽ αὐτὸν κήρυκας ἐπεπόμφει, τοὺς πρὸ μακρῶν ἐτῶν καὶ τοῦ συγκλεισμοῦ τὴν Θεσσαλονίκην ἀπολιπόντας καὶ μετοικήσαντας ἀλλαχοῦ πρὸς αὐτὴν ἵν᾽ ἐπανελθεῖν πολλῷ τῷ τάχει καταναγκάσωσι καὶ τὰ οἰκεῖα πάλιν ὡς τὸ πρότερον ἀπολάβωσι. σκοπὸς γὰρ αὐτὸν πάνυ τι καλὸς καὶ πολλῶν ἄξιος τῶν ἐπαίνων εἰσήῃει, τὴν πόλιν καὶ αὖθις τοῖς οἰκήτορσιν ἀποδεδωκέναι καὶ πλήρη καθάπερ καὶ τὸ πρὶν ἀποκαταστῆσαι.' [and first, he sent his messengers everywhere, and those who had left Thessalonica before many long years and during the siege and went to live elsewhere, he forced with great speed to come back towards it, and to enjoy their homes again as before. His purpose was good in every way and he came to be worthy of many commendations, giving back the city to its inhabitants, and restoring everything to how it was before], Anagnostes, *Narratio*, pp. 518–19.
25. Anagnostes, *Narratio*, pp. 518–19, as above.
26. Ibid., p. 525.
27. Ibid., p. 525.
28. Ibid., p. 526.
29. In Anagnostes, *Monodia*:

ὦ πῶς μαγνήτιδος τρόπον εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἅπαντας εἵλκεν [o, how like a compass (the city) attracted everyone to itself], p. 530.
ὦ χρόνε [o time], p. 530.
ὦ πόλις [o city], pp. 530–1.
ὦ πῶς σου τὴν πρὶν εὐκοσμίαν ἀφήρησαι [o how you lost your previous gracefulness], p. 531.
ὦ παρόντες [o present listeners], p. 531.
ὦ πράγματος ξένου [o foreign incident], p. 532.
ὦ θεοῦ ἀνοχὴ [o tolerance of god], p. 532.
ὦ τόπων θεῷ ἀφωσιωμένων [o places dedicated to god], p. 533.
ὦ πῶς ὁ τῆς εὐημερίας ἡμῖν καιρὸς ἐπιθέσεως καὶ καταδρομῆς γέγονε [o, how the time of prosperity has become one of attack and raid], 533.

30. Ibid., p. 529.
31. Ibid., p. 533.
32. Ibid., p. 530.
33. Ibid., p. 530.
34. Ibid., p. 533.
35. Ibid., p. 532.
36. Ibid., p. 530.
37. Ibid., p. 531.
38. Anagnostes, *Monodia*, p. 531.
39. For thin darkness: cf. Isaiah 42:16: 'And I will bring the blind by a way that they knew not; I will lead them in paths that they have not known: I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight. These things will I do unto them, and not forsake them.'; cf. Isaiah 45:7: 'I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things.'; cf. Amos 8:9: 'And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day'; cf. Zechariah 14:6: 'And it shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be clear, nor dark'.
40. Ibid., p. 530.
41. Ibid., p. 533.
42. Ibid., p. 531.
43. Ibid., p. 532.
44. Ibid.. Cf. the expression 'ξένον τέρας' [unfamiliar monster] in Doukas, p. 200.
45. Anagnostes, *Monodia*, p. 532.
46. Ibid., p. 533.
47. Ibid.. Cf. Leviticus 26.
48. Cf. also:'τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἡμετέρων σφαλμάτων' [the multitude of our own errors], Anagnostes, *Narratio*, p. 521; 'πολλὰ γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ συνεγνωκὼς πταίσματα, τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν σῶν λιτῶν δέομαι βοηθείας εἰς τὴν τούτων ἀπόνιψιν ' [because I am aware of many faults in myself, and I pray for the help of your entreaties in their cleansing], ibid., 528; 'διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν' [for our own sins], Doukas, p. 200. There is a glimmer of hope in Anagnostes's mind,

when he writes that perhaps things may change for the better μεσιτεύσαντος τοῦ ἡμεδαποῦ τροπαιούχου καὶ μάρτυρος [with the mediation of our native-born trophy winner and martyr]. Anagnostes, *Narratio*, p. 527. This window of optimism is a recognisable characteristic in Greek laments, when those refer to the destruction or fall of a city. There is a vague hope expressed that things will one day change, and return to their former state of happiness. This underlying hope within grief is often reflected musically, even when there is only fleeting reference to it in the text of a poem. Their equivalent pieces written for lamenting the death of a person are totally immersed in anguish and torment, and they offer no consolation whatsoever. An archetypal example of this is the lamentation of Hector at the end of the *Iliad*, which the women take in turns.

49. Anagnostes, *Monodia*, p. 534.

Bibliography

Collections of Primary Sources

Halkin, François, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* (Brussels, 1957)

Lemerle, Paul, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius et de la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans*, 2 vols (Paris, 1979)

Majeska, George P., *Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Washington DC, 1984)

Melville-Jones, John R., *Venice and Thessalonica 1423–1430: The Greek Accounts*, Archivio del Litorale Adriatico 8 (Padua, 2006)

—— *Venice and Thessalonica 1423–1430: The Venetian Documents*, Archivio del Litorale Adriatico 7 (Padua, 2002)

Mertzios, K., *Μνημεῖα Μακεδονικῆς Ἱστορίας* (Thessalonica, 1947)

Miklosich, F. and Müller, W., *Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi Sacra et Profana*, 6 vols (Vienna, 1860–90)

Pitra, Joannes Baptista, *Sacra et Classica*, 7 vols (Paris and Rome, 1876–91) – vols 1–6 and 8, vol. 7 not published

Schirò, Giuseppe, *Analecta Hymnica Graeca e Codicibus Eruta Italiae Inferioris: II. Canones Octobris* (Rome, 1979)

Schreiner, Peter, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, CFHB 12, 3 vols (Vienna, 1975–7)

Thomas, J.P. and Hero, A.C., *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: a Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*, 5 vols (Washington DC, 2000)

The Akathistos Hymn, ed. Egon Wellesz (Copenhagen, 1957)

The Oxford Version of the Achilleid, ed. Ole L. Smith (Copenhagen, 1990)

Akropolites, Constantine, 'Λόγος εἰς τὸν μεγαλομάρτυρα καὶ μυροβλύτην Δημήτριον', ed. Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus, in *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας*, 5 vols (St Petersburg, 1891), i. 211–13

Anagnostes, John, *De Extremo Thessalonicensi Excidio Narratio*, ed. Barthold Georg Niebuhr, CHSB (Bonn, 1838)

—— *Pro Viribus Acta Monodia*, ed. Barthold Georg Niebuhr, CHSB (Bonn, 1838)

Bartusis, Mark, Ben Nasser, Khalifa, and Laiou, Angeliki E., 'Days and deeds of a hesychast saint: a translation of the Greek life of Saint Romylos', *Byzantine Studies/Études Byzantines* 9 (1982), 24–47

Bertandon de la Broquière, *The Voyage d'Outremer*, trans. Galen R. Kline (New York, 1988)

Choniates, Niketas, *Historia*, ed. J.-L. Van Dieten, CFHB 11, 2 vols (Berlin and New York, 1975)

Chortasmenos, John, *Johannes Chortasmenos. Briefe, Gedichte, kleine Schriften*, ed. Herbert Hunger, Wiener Byzantinistische Studien 7 (Vienna, 1969)

Choumnos, Makarios, 'Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Δημήτριον', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *Gregorios Palamas* 38 (1955), 347–9

Choumnos, Nikephoros, 'Θεσσαλονικεύσι συμβουλευτικός', in *Anecdota Graeca,* ed. J. Boissonade, 5 vols (Paris, 1830), ii. 235–87

Chrysoloras, Demetrius, *'Action de grâces de Démétrius Chrysoloras à la Théotokos pour l'anniversaire de la bataille d'Ankara (28 Juillet 1403)',* ed. Paul Gautier, *Revue des Études Byzantines* 19 (1961), 348–56

—— *'Comparatio Veterum Imperatorum et nunc Imperatoris Manuelis Palaeologi', in* Spyridon P. Lambros, *Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά,* 4 vols (Athens 1912–30), iii. 222–45

—— *'Demetrio Crisoloras el Palaciego, Encomio de la pulga'*, ed. G. de Andrés, *Helmantica 35* (1984), 51–69
—— 'Τοῦ λογιωτάτου κυροῦ Δημητρίου τοῦ Χρυσολωρᾶ, Λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Δημήτριον καὶ εἰς τὰ μύρα', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *Gregorios Palamas* 40 (1957), 342–53
Chrysoloras, Manuel, 'Epistola ad Joannem Imperatorem', *PG* 156. cols. 23–54
Chrysostom, John, 'Ad Populum Antiochenum Habitae, Homilia III', *PG* 49. 47–60
—— 'In hoc Apostoli Dictum, Utinam Sustineretis Modicum quid Insipientiae Meae (2 Cor. 11.1)', *PG* 51. 301–10
—— 'Commentarius in Acta Apostolorum Homilia XXXI', *PG* 60. 227–34
—— 'Sermo Admonitorius sub Initum Sanctae Quadragesimae, Homilia XI', *PG* 53. 90–8
—— 'Argumentum Epistolae Primae ad Corinthios, Homilia VI', *PG* 61. 47–54
—— 'In Secundam ad Corinthios Epistolam Commentarius, Homilia XXVI', *PG* 61. 569–610
—— 'Commentarius in Epistolam ad Romanos, Homilia XXXII', *PG* 60. 675–82
—— 'Laudatio Sancti Martyris Barlaam', *PG* 50. 675–82
Comnena, Anna, *Alexiade*, ed. B. Leib, 3 vols (Paris, 1937–45). English translation E.R.A. Sewter, *The Alexiad of Anna Comnena* (Harmondsworth, 1969)
Darrouzès, J., 'Lettres de 1453', *REB* 22 (1964), 72–127
Dennis, George T., 'The Byzantine Turkish treaty of 1403', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 33 (1967), 72–88 and reprinted in George T. Dennis, *Byzantium and the Franks* (London, 1982), No. VI
—— 'Nicholas Cabasilas Chamaëtos and his discourse on abuses committed by authorities against sacred things', *Byzantine Studies/Études Byzantines* 5 (1978), 80–7 and reprinted in George T. Dennis, *Byzantium and the Franks 1350–1420* (London, 1982), no. XI
Digenes Akritis: the Grottaferrata and Escorial Versions, ed. and transl. Elizabeth Jeffreys (Cambridge, 1998)
Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, ed. I. Bekker, CSHB (Bonn, 1834)

Ecthesis Chronica, ed. Spyridon P. Lambros (London, 1902)
Eustathios of Thessalonica, *The Capture of Thessaloniki*, ed. and trans. John R. Melville-Jones, Byzantina Australiensia 8 (Canberra, 1988)
Gabriel of Thessalonica, 'Ὁμιλίαι', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *Athina* 57 (1953), 142–73
Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum, trans. Rosalind Hill (Oxford, 1962)
Gouillard, J., 'Le synodikon de l'Orthodoxie, édition et commentaire', *Travaux et Mémoires* 2 (1967), 1–316
Gregoras, Nikephoros, 'Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια εἰς τὸν Ἅγιον Δημήτριον', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *M* 4 (1955–60), 83–96
—— *Byzantina Historia*, ed. L. Schopen, CSHB, 2 vols (Bonn, 1829–30)
Gregory of Nyssa, *Opera*, ed. Werner Jaeger (Leiden, 1960–), especially vol. 10.1
Harmenopoulos, Constantine, 'Λόγος Ανέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενόπουλου εις την Προεόρτιον Εορτήν του Αγίου Δημητρίου', ed. Demetrius Gines, *EEBS* 21 (1951), 145–62
—— 'Tomus Contra Gregorium Palamam', in *Graecia Orthodoxa*, ed. Leon Allatius, 2 vols (Rome, 1652), i. 780–5
Isidore Glavas, 'Ἰσιδώρου ἀρχιεσκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης ὁμιλίαι εἰς τὰς ἑορτὰς τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *Hellenika Supplement* 5 (1954), 19–65
John Klimakos, *Κλῖμαξ*, ed. Archimandrite Ignatios (Oropos, Attica, 2002). English translation by Colm Luibheid and Norman Russell, *John Climacus: The Ladder of Divine Ascent* (London, 1982)
Kaminiates, John, *The Capture of Thessaloniki*, ed. and trans. David Frendo and Athanasios Fotiou, Byzantina Australiensia 12 (Perth, 2000)
Kantakouzenos, John, *Ioannis Cantacuzeni Eximperatoris Historiarum*, ed. Ludwig Schopen, CSHB, 3 vols (Bonn, 1828–32)

Katsaros, Vassilis and Vlachakos, Petros, *῾Αγιος Δημήτριος, Εγκωμιαστικοί Λόγοι Επιφανών Βυζαντινών Λογίων* (Thessalonica, 2004)

Kavasilas, Nicholas, 'De Vita in Christo'. French translation with Greek text by Marie-Hélène Congourdeau, *La Vie en Christ*, Sources Chrétiennes 355, 361, 2 vols (Paris, 1989–90). English translation by Carmino J. deCatanzaro, *The Life in Christ* (Crestwood NY, 1974).

—— *Explication de la divine liturgie*, introduction and ed. Sévérien Salaville, Sources Chrétiennes 4 (Paris, 1967). English translation by J.M. Hussey and P.A. McNulty, *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* (London, 1960)

—— 'Εἰς τὸν πανάγιον Δημήτριον καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ θαύματα' in *ΝικολάουΚαβάσιλα, Επτά Ανέκδοτοι Λόγοι το πρώτον νυν εκδιδόμενοι,* ed. Vassileios Pseutongás (Thessalonica, 1976), pp. 135–42

—— 'Λόγος Κατὰ Τοκιζόντων', *PG* 150. 753–72

—— 'Νικολάου Καβάσιλα, Προσφώνημα καὶ ῾Επιγράμματα εἰς ῞Αγιον Δημήτριον', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *EEBS* 22 (1952), 97–109

—— 'Προσφώνημα εἰς τὸν ἔνδοξον τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεγαλομάρτυρα Δημήτριον τὸν Μυροβλύτην', *Mnemeia hagiologika*, ed. Theophilos Joannou (Venice, 1884), pp. 67–114

—— 'Le traité inédit "Sur L'usure" de Nicolas Cabasilas', ed. Rodolphe Guilland, in *Εἰς Μνήμην Σπυρίδωνος Λάμπρου* (Athens, 1935), 269–77

Kokkinos, Philotheos, ᾽Ακολουθία τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Πατρός ἡμῶν Γρηγορίου, ᾽Αρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης τοῦ Παλαμά (Athos and Piraeus, 1978)

—— 'Encomium Gregorii Palamae', in *῾Αγιολογικὰ ῞Εργα, Α′ Θεσσαλονικεῖς ῞Αγιοι*, ed. D. Tsames (Thessalonica, 1985), pp. 425–591

—— 'Φιλοθέου, Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Δημήτριον', ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *M* 2 (1941–52), 556–82

—— ‘Ἐγκώμιον εις Ἅγιον Μεγαλομάρτυρα Δημήτριον τον Μυροβλήτην’, in *Ἁγιολογικὰ Ἔργα, Α′ Θεσσαλονικεῖς Ἅγιοι*, ed. Demetrius Tsames (Thessalonica, 1985), 33–60
—— ‘Vita Isidori Patriarchae’, in *Ἁγιολογικὰ Ἔργα, Α′ Θεσσαλονικεῖς Ἅγιοι*, ed. Demetrius Tsames (Thessalonica, 1985), pp. 327–423
Kugeas, S., ‘Notizbuch eines beamten der Metropolis in Thessalonike’, *BZ* 23 (1914–20), 143–63
Kydones, Demetrius, *Correspondance*, ed. R.-J. Loenertz, 2 vols (Vatican City, 1956–60)
Lucian of Samosata, *Essays in Portraiture*, in *Lucian, Volume IV*, ed. and trans. A.M. Harmon, (London and Cambridge MA, 1925), pp. 255–95
Manuel II Palaiologos, *Dialogue with the Empress-Mother on Marriage*, ed. and trans. Athanasios Angelou (Vienna, 1991)
—— *Letters*, ed. George T. Dennis, CFHB (Washington DC, 1977)
Mauropous, John, ‘Canones III’, in Francesco d’ Aiuto, ‘Tre canoni di Giovanni Mauropode in onore di santi militari’, Supplement 13 to *Bollettino dei Classici* (Rome, 1994), pp. 120–137
Metochites, Theodore, ‘Βυζαντινά καὶ Μεταβυζαντινά Ἐγκώμια εἰς τὸν Ἅγιον Δημήτριον’, ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *M* 4 (1955–60), 56–82
Neophytos the Recluse, ‘Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον καὶ ἔνδοξον μεγαλομάρτυρα Χριστοῦ Δημήτριον’, ed. V. Laourdas, ‘Βυζαντινὰ καὶ μεταβυζαντινὰ ἐγκώμια εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Δημήτριον’, *M* 4 (1955–60), 49–55
Palamas, Gregory, ‘Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὁμιλία εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις μεγαλομάρτυρα καὶ θαυματουργὸν καὶ μυροβλύτην Δημήτριον’, *Gregorii Thessalonicensis Orationes X*, ed. Christian Friedrich Matthaei (Moscow, 1776), pp. 44–60
Philes, Manuel, *Carmina*, ed. E. Miller, 2 vols (Paris, 1855–7)
Philippidis-Braat, A., ‘L’enkômion de saint Démétrius par Jean de Thessalonique’, *Travaux et Mémoires* 8 (1981), 397–414
Photios, *Bibliothèque*, ed. René Henry, 9 vols (Paris, 1974)
Pseudo-Lucian, *Timarion*, ed. Roberto Romano, Byzantina et neohellenica neapolitana 2 (Naples, 1974), reprinted in *La satira bizantina dei secoli 11–15 : ‘Il patriota’, ‘Caridemo’,*

'Timarione', Cristoforo di Mitilene, Michele Psello, Teodoro Prodromo, 'Carmi ptocoprodromici', Michele Haplucheir, Giovanni Catrara, 'Mazaris', 'La messa del glabro', 'Sinassario del venerabile asino', ed. Roberto Romano (Turin, 1999)

Robert of Clari, *The Conquest of Constantinople*, trans. E.H. McNeal (Toronto, 1996)

Romanos Melodos, *Cantica Dubia*, ed. Paul Maas and C.A. Trypanis (Berlin, 1970)

Scholarios, George Kourtesis, 'Fragmentum Panegyrici in Sanctum Demetrium', in *Oeuvres complétes de Georges Scholarios*, Louis Petit, X.A. Siderides and Martin Jugie, 8 vols (Paris, 1928–35), i. 238–46

Skylitzes, John, *Synopsis Historiarum*, ed. J. Thurn, CFHB 5 (Berlin and New York, 1973)

Sphrantzes, George, *Cronaca*, ed. Riccardo Maisano (Rome, 1990)

Stavrakios, John, 'Ἰωάννου Σταυρακίου λόγος εἰς τὰ θαύματα τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου', ed. Ioakeim Iberites, *M* 1 (1940), 324–76

Symeon Metaphrastes, 'St Demetrii Martyris Acta', *PG* 116. 1081–1426

—— 'Vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi', *PG* 114. 1045–1210

Symeon of Thessalonica, 'De Sacra Precatione', *PG* 155. 535–670

—— 'De Sacris Ordinationibus', *PG* 155. 361–470

—— 'De Sacro Templo et ejus Consecratione', *PG* 155. 305–62

—— 'Διδασκαλία πρὸς τὸν εὐσεβῆ δεσπότην κυρὸν Ἀνδρόνικον', *Politico-Historical Works*, ed. David Balfour (Vienna, 1979), pp. 78–82

—— 'Homilia Festalis in Sanctum Demetrium', in *St Symeon Archbishop of Thessalonica, Ἔργα Θεολογικὰ*, ed. David Balfour, Analekta Vlatadon (Thessalonica, 1981), pp. 185–94

—— *Τα Λειτουργικά Συγγράμματα*, ed. Ioannis Phountoules (Thessalonica, 1968)

—— 'Λόγος ἱστορικός (θαύματα Ἁγίου Δημητρίου)', *Politico-Historical Works*, ed. David Balfour (Vienna, 1979), pp. 39–69

—— 'Συμβουλία καὶ εὐχὴ τοῖς ἱσταμένοις πιστῶς ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ τοῖς ἐναντίως ἔχουσιν ἐπιτίμησις', *Politico-Historical Works,* ed. David Balfour (Vienna, 1979), pp. 83–7

—— ‘Συμβουλία ὁμοίως περὶ τοῦ ἵστασθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ κατὰ τῶν φρονούντων τὰ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐπιτίμησις’, *Politico-Historical Works*, ed. David Balfour (Vienna, 1979), pp. 88–90

Symeon of Thessalonica (attributed), ‘Ἀκριβής διάταξις τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου’, ed. Vassileios Laourdas, *Gregorios Palamas* 39 (1956), 326–41

Syropoulos, Sylvester, *Mémoires*, ed. and trans. V. Laurent, Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores 9 (Rome, 1971)

Theodore of Stoudios, ‘Laudatio S. Platonis Hegumeni’, *PG* 99. 803–50

Secondary Works

Anastasiou, Ioannes E., 'Νικολάου Καβάσιλα· δύο έργα για τον τόκο'', *PThS,* 87–102

Angelopoulos, Athanasios, *'*Τὸ γενεαλογικὸν δένδρον τῆς οἰκογενείας τῶν Καβασιλῶν*', M* 17 (1977), 367–95

—— *Νικόλαος Καβάσιλας Χαμαετός και το έργο αυτού* (Thessalonica, 1970)

Angold, Michael, *The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1204: A Political History* (2nd edn, Harlow, 1997)

Argyriou, Asterios, *Macaire Makrès et la polémique contre l'Islam,* Studi e Testi 314 (Vatican City, 1986)

Bakirtzis, Charalambos*,* 'Pilgrimage to Thessalonike: the tomb of St. Demetrios'*, DOP* 56 (2002), 175–92

—— 'The urban continuity and size of late Byzantine Thessalonike'*, DOP* 57 (2003), 35–64

Barker, John W., *'Late Byzantine Thessalonike: a second city's challenges and responses', DOP* 57 (2003), 5–33

—— *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391–1425): A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship* (New Brunswick NJ, 1969)

—— 'The problem of appanages in Byzantium during the Palaiologan period', *Byzantina* 3 (1971), 103–22

Barnes, Timothy D., *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge MA, 1962)

Beck, Hans-Georg, 'Der byzantinische "Ministerpräsident"'*, BZ* 48 (1955), 309–38

—— *Theodoros Metochites: die Krise des byzantinischen Weltbildes im 14. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1952)

Beldiceanu-Steinherr, I., 'La conquête d'Andrinople par les Turcs: la pénétration turque en Thrace et la valeur des chroniques ottomanes'*, Travaux et Mémoires* 1 (1965), 439–61

Bendall, S. and Donald, P.J., *The Later Palaeologan Coinage* (London, 1979)

Bobrinskoy, Boris, 'Nicolas Cabasilas and hesychast spirituality', *Sobornost* 7 (1968), 485–505

Broneer, Oscar, *'The Apostle Paul and the Isthmian Games', The Biblical Archaeologist* 25 (1962), 2–31
Brown, Peter, 'The rise and function of the holy man in Late Antiquity', in Peter Brown, *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1982), pp. 103–52
Browning, Robert, 'Byzantine Thessalonike: a unique city?'*, Dialogos* 2 (1995), 91–104
—— 'Homer in Byzantium', *Viator* 6 (1975), 15–33
—— 'The Byzantines and Homer', in *Homer's Ancient Readers: the Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes,* ed. Robert Lamberton and John J. Keaney (Princeton NJ, 1992), pp. 134–48
Burnand, Teodora, 'Donors and Iconography: The Case of the Church "St. Virgin" in Dolna Kamenitsa (XIV c.)', in *Spirituality in late Byzantium; Essays Presenting New Research by International Scholars*, ed. Eugenia Russell (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2009), pp. 99–105
Cameron, Averil M., *Procopius and the Sixth Century* (London, 1985)
Cammelli, Giuseppe*, 'Andronico Callisto'*, La Rinascità 5 (1942), 104–21, 174–214
Constantinides, C.N., *Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries (1204–ca.1310)* (Nicosia, 1982)
Cormack, Robin, *Writing in Gold: Byzantine Society and its Icons* (London, 1985)
Cunningham, Mary, 'Innovation or mimesis in sermons?', *Originality in Byzantine Literature, Art and Music,* ed. A. R. Littlewood (Oxford, 1995), pp. 67–80
Davis, John, 'Manuel II Palaeologus' A Depiction of Spring in a Dyed, Woven Hanging', in *Porphyrogenita: Essays on Byzantine History and Culture and the Latin East Presented to Julian Chrysostomides*, ed. Charalambos Dendrinos, Jonathan Harris, Eirene Harvalia-Crook and Judith Herrin (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 411–21
Demetrakopoulos, J.A., 'Nicholas Cabasilas' Questio de Rationes Valore: an anti-Palamite defense of secular wisdom', *Byzantina* 19 (1998), 53–93
Dennis, George T., 'John VII Palaiologos: "A holy and just man"', in *Byzantium State and Society: In Memory of Nikos Oikonomides,* ed.

Anna Avramea, Angeliki E. Laiou and Evangelos Chrysos (Athens, 2003), pp. 205–17
—— *'The late Byzantine metropolitans of Thessalonike', DOP 57 (2003), 255–64*
—— 'The perils of the deep', *Novum Millennium: Studies on Byzantine History and Culture Dedicated to Paul Speck*, ed. Claudia Sode and Sarolta Takács (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 81–88
—— *The Reign of Manuel Palaeologus in Thessalonica, 1382–1387*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 159 (Rome, 1960)
Duffy, John, 'Embellishing the steps: elements of presentation and style in "The Heavenly Ladder" of John Climacus', *DOP* 53 (1999), 1–17
Easterling, P.E., 'Sophocles and the Byzantine student', in *Porphyrogenita: Essays on Byzantine History and Culture and the Latin East Presented to Julian Chrysostomides*, ed. Charalambos Dendrinos, Jonathan Harris, Eirene Harvalia-Crook and Judith Herrin (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 319–34
Enepekides, P., 'Der Briefwechsel des Mystikers Nikolaos Kabasilas', *BZ* 46 (1953), 29–45
Eustratiades, Sophronios, '῾Αγιολογικά. ῾Ο ῞Αγιος Δημήτριος ἐν τῇ ῾Υμνογραφίᾳ', *EEBS* 11 (1935), 120–50
Floyd, Edwin D., 'What light do Nonnos, Paraphrase of John 1.3 and the Nicene Creed shed on one another?', unpublished paper, http://www.pitt.edu/~edfloyd/Nonnos.Creed.html (Accessed 14 August 2008)
Frendo, J.D., 'The miracles of St. Demetrius and the capture of Thessaloniki', *Byzantinoslavica* 58 (1997), 205–24
Frolow, A., 'Un nouveau reliquaire byzantin', *Revue des Études Grecques*, 66 (1953), 100–10
Geanakoplos, Deno J., 'Theodore Gaza, a Byzantine scholar of the Palaeologan "renaissance" in the Italian Renaissance', in Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West* (Madison WI, 1989), pp. 68–90
Gerstel, Sharon E. J., 'Civic and monastic influences on church decoration in late Byzantine Thessalonike', *DOP* 57 (2003), 225–39

Gill, Joseph, 'George Scholarius', in Joseph Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence and other Essays* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 79–94
Grabar, André, 'Un nouveau reliquaire de St Demetrios', *DOP* 8 (1954), 305–13
Guilland, Rodolphe, *Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras: l'homme et l'oeuvre* (Paris, 1926)
Gyorgevich, Milan, 'Nicolas Cabasilas – One way towards a synthesis of the traditions', www.kaad.de/Boerse/Projekte/Gyorgevich.htm (Accessed on 2 August 2008)
Hannick, Christian, 'Thessalonique dans l'histoire de la musique écclesiastique byzantine', *Η Θεσσαλονίκη μεταξύ Ανατολής και Δύσεως* (Thessalonica, 1982), pp. 111–20
Harris, Jonathan, *Greek Émigrés in the West, 1400–1520* (Camberley, 1995)
—— *Byzantium and the Crusades* (London and New York, 2003)
—— *Constantinople: Capital of Byzantium* (London and New York, 2007)
—— 'Constantinople as City State, c. 1360–1453', in *Between Byzantines and Turks: Understanding the Late Medieval Mediterranean World*, ed. Catherine Holmes, Jonathan Harris and Eugenia Russell (Oxford, 2010, forthcoming)
Harris, Simon, *Medieval Greek Psalm-Singing* (unpublished)
—— 'The Byzantine office of Genuflection', *Music and Letters* 77 (1996), 333–47
—— 'The Byzantine responds for the two Sundays before Christmas', *Music and Letters* 74 (1993), 1–15
Hart, Theresa, 'Nicephorus Gregoras: historian of the hesychast controversy', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 2 (1951), 169–79
Harvey, Alan, 'Economic conditions in Thessaloniki between the two Ottoman Occupations', in *Mediterranean Urban Culture, 1400–1700*, ed. Alexander Cowan (Exeter, 2000), pp. 115–24
Hetherington, Paul, *Byzantine and Medieval Greece: Churches, Castles and Art* (London, 1991)
Hoffman, George, 'Thessaloniki: The impact of a changing hinterland', *East European Quarterly* 2 (1968), 1–27
Hunger, Herbert, 'The classical tradition in Byzantine literature: the importance of rhetoric', *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*,

ed. Margaret Mullett and Roger Scott (Birmingham, 1981), pp. 35–47
—— 'Laudes Thessalonicenses', *Εορταστικός Τόμος 50 Χρόνια, 1939–1989*, *EMS* (Thessalonica, 1992), pp. 99–113
Hussey, Joan, 'Symeon the New Theologian and Nicholas Cabasilas', *Eastern Churches Review* 4 (1972), 131–40
Hyde, J.K., *Society and Politics in Medieval Italy. The Evolution of the Civil Life, 1000–1350* (London, 1973)
Inalcık, Halil, 'The conquest of Edirne (1361)', *Archivum Ottomanicum* 3 (1971), 185–210
Iosif, Despina, 'Caesar the warrior versus Jesus the peacemaker', *Eulimene* 9 (2003), 167–80
Janin, Raymond, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins (Bithynie, Hellespont, Latros, Galèsios, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique)* (Paris, 1975)
—— *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin: première partie: le siège de Constantinople et le patriarchat oecumenique. Tome III: les églises et les monastères* (2nd edn, Paris, 1969)
Jenkins, Romilly, 'The Hellenistic origins of Byzantine education', *DOP* 17 (1963), 39–52
Jones, A.H.M., Martindale, J.R., Morris, J., *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, AD 260–640*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1971-90)
Kalokyris, Konstantinos, '῾Η θεολογία τοῦ φωτός καί ἡ παλαιολόγειος ζωγραφική', *CTPE*, pp. 343–54
Kazhdan, Alexander P., 'Some questions addressed to the scholars who believe in the authenticity of Kaminiates' "Capture of Thessalonica"', *BZ* 71 (1978), 301–14
Kiel, Machiel, 'Notes on some Turkish monuments in Thessaloniki', *Balkan Studies* 11 (1970), 122–56
Klimenko, Michael, 'On the Divine Liturgy, Nicholas Cabasilas and his Commentary', *Diakonia* 29 (1996), 215–38
Kolias, George, 'Η ανταρσία Ιωάννου Ζ΄ εναντίον Ιωάννου Ε΄ Παλαιολόγου (1390)', *Hellenika* 12 (1952), 34–64
Kustas, George, 'The function and evolution of Byzantine rhetoric', *Viator* 1 (1970), 55–73
Laiou, Angeliki E., 'Economic concerns and attitudes of the intellectuals of Thessalonike', *DOP* 57 (2003), 205–223

Lambros, Spyridon P., ‘῾Αναγραφὴ ἔργων Νικολάου Καβάσιλα καὶ Δημητρίου Κυδώνη ἐν τῷ Παρισιακῷ κώδικι 1213’, *NE* 2 (1905), 299–323
Laourdas, Vassileios, ὠ῾Εγκώμια εἰς τὸν ῞Αγιον Δημήτριον κατὰ τὸν δέκατον τέταρτον αἰῶνα’, *EEBS* 24 (1954), 275–90
—— ‘Η κλασσική φιλολογία εις την Θεσσαλονίκην κατά τον δέκατον τέταρτον αιώνα’, *EMS* 37 (1947), 5–23
—— ‘Τα Δύο Προσφωνήματα εἰς ῞Αγιον Δημήτριον τοῦ Νικολάου Καβάσιλα’, *Hellenika* 13 (1954), 337–9
Laurent, Vitalien, ‘Écrits spirituels inédits de Macaire Choumnos (c.1382), fondateur de la “Néa Moni” à Thessalonique’, *Hellenika* 14 (1955), 40–86
—— ‘Le métropolite Gabriel (1397–1416/19) et le couvent de la Néa Moni’, *Hellenika* 13 (1954), 241–55
—— ‘Le trisépiscopat du patriarche Matthieu Ier, 1397–1410. Un grand procès canonique à Byzance au début du XVe siècle’, *Revue des Études Byzantines* 30 (1972), 5–166
Levy, Kenneth, ‘The Byzantine Communion-cycle and its Slavic counterpart’, *Actes du XIIe congrès internationale des études byzantines: Ochride 1961* (Belgrade, 1964), pp. 571–4
—— ‘A hymn for Thursday in Holy Week’, *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 16 (1963), 127–75
Littlewood, A.R., ‘Literature’, in *Palgrave Advances: Byzantine History*, ed. Jonathan Harris (New York, 2005), pp. 133–46
Livanos, Christopher, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios* (Piscataway NJ, 2006)
Loenertz, R.-J., ‘Isidore Glabas, métropolite de Thessalonique (1380–1396)’, *Revue des Études Byzantines* 6 (1948), 181–90
Lossky, Vladimir, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Cambridge, 1957)
Lot-Borodine, Myrrha, *Un maître de la spiritualité byzantine au XIVe siècle: Nicolas Cabasilas* (Paris, 1958)
Macrides, Ruth J., ‘Subversion and loyalty in the cult of St. Demetrios’, *Byzantinoslavica* 51 (1990), 189–97
Magdalino, Paul, ‘Saint Demetrios and Leo VI’, *Byzantinoslavica* 51 (1990), 198–201

Maksimovic, Ljubomir, 'Η Μακεδονία μεταξύ της Λατινικής και Σερβικής κατακτήσεως. Το πρόβλημα της συνέχειας του βυζαντινού διοικητικού συστήματος', *Vyzantine Makedonia* (Thessalonica, 1995), pp. 195–207

Mango, Cyril, 'Antique statuary and the Byzantine beholder', *DOP* 17 (1963), 55–75

—— 'Byzantine literature as a distorting mirror' (Inaugural lecture, University of Oxford, May 1974) in: Cyril Mango, *Byzantium and its image* (London, 1984), No. II, pp. 3–18

Mantovanis, Paul Chr., 'The Eucharistic theology of Nicolas Cabasilas', University of Oxford, DPhil thesis (1984)

Matschke, Klaus-Peter, *Fortschritt und Reaktion in Byzanz im 14. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1971)

Mertzios, K., *Μνημεῖα Μακεδονικῆς ἱστορίας* (Thessalonica, 1947)

Meyendorff, John, *Byzantine Theology* (New York, 1974)

—— 'Continuities and discontinuities in Byzantine religious thought', *DOP* 47 (1993), 69–81

—— *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, trans. George Lawrence (Crestwood NY, 1998)

Miller, Timothy, 'The plague in John VI Cantacuzenus and Thucydides', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 17 (1976), 385–95

Mitchell, Margaret M., 'The archetypal image: John Chrysostom's portraits of Paul', *The Journal of Religion* 75 (1995), 15–43

Moschos, Demetrius, *Πλατωνισμός ἡ Χριστιανισμός: Οι φιλοσοφικές προϋποθέσεις του Αντιησυχασμού του Νικηφόρου Γρηγορά* (Athens, 1998)

Necipoglu, Nevra, 'The aristocracy in late Byzantine Thessalonike: a case study of the city's archontes (late 14th and early 15th centuries)', *DOP* 57 (2003), 133–51

—— *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins : A Study of Political Attitudes in the Late Palaiologan Period, 1370–1460* (Ann Arbor MI, 1990)

Nellas, Panayiotis, 'Redemption or deification? Nicholas Kavasilas and Anselm's question "Why did God become Man?"', *Sourozh* 66 (1996), 10–30

Nicol, Donald M., 'The Byzantine Church and Hellenic learning in the fourteenth century', in Donald M. Nicol, *Byzantium: its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World*, (London, 1972), No. XII

—— *The Byzantine Lady: Ten Portraits, 1250–1500* (Cambridge, 1994)

—— *Byzantium and Venice: A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations* (Cambridge, 1988)

—— 'Constantine Akropolites: A prosopographical note', *DOP* 19 (1965), 249–56

—— *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453* (2nd edn, Cambridge, 1993)

—— 'Thessalonica as a cultural centre in the fourteenth century', *Η Θεσσαλονίκη μεταξύ Ανατολής και Δύσεως* (Thessalonica, 1982), pp. 121–31, reprinted in Nicol, *Studies in Late Byzantine History and Prosopography* (London, 1986), no. X

Obolensky, Dimitri, 'The cult of St Demetrius of Thessaloniki in the history of Byzantine-Slav relations', in Dimitri Obolensky, *Byzantium and the Slavs* (Crestwood NY, 1994), pp. 280–300

Oehler, K., 'Aristotle in Byzantium', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 5 (1964), 133–46

Oikonomides, Nicolas, 'John VII Palaeologus and the ivory pyxis at Dumbarton Oaks', *DOP* 31 (1977), 329–37

Papadatou, Daphne, 'Political associations in the late Byzantine period: The Zealots and sailors of Thessalonica', *Balkan Studies* 28 (1987), 3–23

Papadopoulos, Antonios, *Ο άγιος Δημήτριος εις την Ελληνικήν και Βουλγαρικήν παράδοσιν* (Thessalonica, 1971)

—— 'Εγκώμια στον Άγιο Δημήτριο κατά την Παλαιολόγεια Εποχή και ο εορτασμός του αγίου στη Θεσσαλονίκη', *CTPE*, pp. 129–45

—— 'Νικόλαος Καβάσιλας: φιλομόναχος και φιλομάρτυς', *PThS*, 173–88

Papazoglou, Aris, 'Η πολιορκία της Θεσσαλονίκης του 1416 και η συνθήκη ειρήνης μεταξύ του Ιωάννη Η΄ Παλαιολόγου και του Μωάμεθ Α΄', *Thessaloniki* 3 (1992), 45–57

Pelekanides, Stelios, ‘Παρατηρήσεις τινές εις Συμεών Θεσσαλονίκης “Διάταξις ἀκριβής τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ ῾Αγίου Δημητρίου” ’, *M* 4 (1955–60), 410–15

—— *Παλαιοχριστιανικά Μνημεία Θεσσαλονίκης. Αχειροποίητος, Μονή Λατόμου* (Thessalonica, 1949)

Pezopoulos, E.A., ‘Ποικίλα προσῳδιακὰ μέτρα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ ποιήσει’, *EEBS* 17 (1941), 286–97

Phountoules, Ioannes, ‘Ιδιορρυθμίες της Λειτουργικής Πράξεως της Θεσσαλονίκης κατά τις Αρχές του ΙΕ΄ αιώνος’, *CTPE*, 149–63

—— *Τὸ Λειτουργικὸ Ἔργο Συμεὼν τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης (Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν Ἱστορίαν καὶ Θεωρίαν τῆς Θείας Λατρείας)* (Thessalonica, 1960)

Prinzing, G., ‘Demetrios-Kirche und Aseniden-Aufstand. Zur chronologischen Präzisierung der Frühphase des Aseniden-Aufstandes’, *Zbornik radova vizantoloskog instituta* 38 (1999–2000), 257–65

Pseutongás, Vassileios, ‘Ο Νικόλαος Καβάσιλας ήταν Ησυχαστής ή Αντιησυχαστής;’, *PThS*, 203–22

Runciman, Steven, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1970)

Russell, Norman, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (Oxford, 2004)

—— ‘“Partakers of the divine nature” (2 Peter 1:4) in the Byzantine tradition’, in *Kathegetria: Essays Presented to Joan Hussey for her 80th Birthday*, ed. J. Chrysostomides (Camberley, 1988), pp. 51–67

—— ‘Prochoros Cydones and the fourteenth-century understanding of Orthodoxy’, in *Byzantine Orthodoxies*, ed. Andrew Louth and Augustine Casiday (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 75–91

—— ‘Theosis and Gregory Palamas: continuity or doctrinal change?’ *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 50 (2006), 357–79

Salaville, Sévérien, ‘Le christocentrisme de Nicolas Cabasilas’, *Échos d’Orient* 35 (1936), 129–67

—— ‘Vues sotériologiques chez Nicolas Cabasilas (XIVe siècle)’, *Études Byzantines* 1 (1943), 5–57

Saradi, Helen, 'The Kallos of the Byzantine city: The development of a rhetorical topos and historical reality', *Gesta* 34 (1995), 37–56
Scott, Roger, 'The classical tradition in Byzantine historiography', in *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*, ed. Margaret Mullett and Roger Scott (Birmingham, 1981), pp. 61–74
Sear, David R., *Byzantine Coins and their Values* (2nd edn, London, 1987)
Sevcenko, Ihor, 'The Palaeologan renaissance', in *Renaissances before the Renaissance: Cultural Revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. Warren Treadgold (Stanford CA, 1984), pp. 144–71
—— 'Theodore Metochites, the Chora, and the intellectual trends of his time', in *The Kariye Djami*, ed. Paul A. Underwood, 4 vols (Princeton NJ, 1968–75), iv. 19–91
Sinkewicz, R.E., 'Gregory Palamas', in *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition (13–19 siècle)*, ed. C.G. Contizello and V. Contizello (Turnhout, 2002), pp. 131–88
Skedros, J.C., *Saint Demetrios of Thessaloniki: Civic Patron and Divine Protector 4th–7th Centuries CE* (Harrisburg PA, 1999)
Soteriou, George and Soteriou, Mary, *Ἡ Βασιλική τοῦ Ἁγίου Δημητρίου Θεσσαλονίκης* (Athens, 1952)
Speake, Graham, 'Janus Lascaris' visit to Mount Athos in 1491', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 34 (1993), 325–30
Spiteris, Yannis, 'Nicolas Cabasilas Chamaetos', *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition II (XIII–XIX s.)*, Corpus Christianorum, ed. Carmello Guiseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello (Turnhout, 2002), pp. 315–95
Stathes, Gregorios, 'Η ασματική διαφοροποίηση στον κώδικα ΕΒΕ 2548', *CTPE*, 167–99
Strunk, Oliver, 'The Byzantine office at Hagia Sophia', in Oliver Strunk, *Essays on Music in the Byzantine World* (New York, 1977), pp. 112–50
Taft, Robert F., 'Christian liturgical psalmody: origins, development, decomposition, collapse', in *Psalms in Community: Jewish and Christian Textual, Liturgical and Artistic Tradition* (New Haven CT, 2002), pp. 7–32

Tapkova-Zaimova, V., 'Le culte de saint Démétrius à Byzance et aux Balkans', *Miscellanea Bulgarica* 5 (1987), 139–46
Theocharides, G. I., 'Η Νέα Μονή Θεσσαλονίκης', *M* 3 (1953–5), 334–52
—— ' Δύο Νέα Έγγραφα Αφορώντα εις την Νέαν Μονήν Θεσσαλονίκης', *M* 4 (1955–60), 315–51
Tinnefeld, Franz, 'Intellectuals in late Byzantine Thessalonike', *DOP* 57 (2003), 153–72
Touliatos-Banker, Diane, 'The Byzantine Orthros', *Byzantina* 9 (1977), 321–83
Tsiaras, Giannis, 'Η Θεσσαλονίκη από τους Βυζαντινούς στους Βενετσιάνους (1423–1430)', *M* 17 (1977), 85–123
Tsirpanlis, C.N., 'The career and writings of Nicolas Cabasilas', *Byzantion* 49 (1979), 414–27
Turner, C.J.G., 'The career of Georgios Gennadios Scholarios', *Byzantion* 39 (1969), 420–55
Vakalopoulos, Apostolos E., 'Γενική θεώρηση τῆς παλαιολογείου ἐποχῆς στήν Θεσσαλονίκη', *CTPE*, pp. 45–51
—— ' Οι Δημοσιευμένες Ομιλίες του Αρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης Ισιδώρου ως Ιστορική Πηγή για τη Γνώση της Πρώτης Τουρκοκρατίας στη Θεσσαλονίκη (1387–1403)', *M* 4 (1955–60), 20–34
—— *Ιστορία της Θεσσαλονίκης (316–1983)* (Thessalonica, 1997)
—— *Origins of the Greek Nation: The Byzantine Period, 1204–1461*, trans. Ian Moles (New Brunswick NJ, 1970)
Vasiliev, A.A., 'An edict of the Emperor Justinian II, September 688', *Speculum* 18 (1943), 1–13
—— 'The historical significance of the mosaic of St Demetrius at Sassoferrato', *DOP* 5 (1950), 31–9
Vavouskos, Konstantinos, 'Το Εμπράγματον Δίκαιον εις την Εξάβιβλον του Αρμενόπουλου', *CTPE*, pp. 237–58
Veis, Nikos, ''Αρμενοπουλικά ᾽Ανάλεκτα', in *Τόμος Κωνσταντίνου Ἁρμενόπουλου. Ἐπί τῇ Ἑξακοσιετηρίδι τῆς Ἐξαβίβλου Αὐτοῦ (1345–1945)* (Thessalonica, 1952), 345–528
Verpeaux, Jean, 'Contribution à l'étude de l'administration byzantine: ὁ μεσάζων', *Byzantinoslavica* 16 (1955), 270–96

Vickers, Michael, 'Cyriac of Ancona in Thessaloniki', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 2 (1976), 75–82
—— 'Sirmium or Thessaloniki? A critical examination of the St Demetrius Legend', *BZ* 67 (1974), 337–50
Völker, Walther, *Die Sakramentmystik des Nikolaus Kabasilas* (Wiesbaden, 1997)
Vryonis, Speros, 'The Ottoman conquest of Thessaloniki in 1430', in *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society*, ed. Anthony Bryer and Heath Lowry (Birmingham, 1986), pp. 281–321
—— 'The *Panegyris* of the Byzantine saint: a study in the nature of a medieval institution, its origins and fate', in *The Byzantine Saint*, ed. Sergei Hackel (Crestwood NY, 2001), pp. 196–228
—— 'The will of a provincial magnate, Eustathius Boilas', *DOP* 11 (1957), 263–77
Waley, Daniel, *The Italian City-Republics* (3rd edn, Harlow, 1988)
Walter, Christopher, 'St Demetrius: The *Myroblytos* of Thessalonika', *Eastern Churches Review* 5 (1973), 157–78, also reprinted in Christopher Walter, *Art and Ritual of the Byzantine Church* (London, 1982), pp. 67–93
—— *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition* (Aldershot, 2003)
Wellesz, Egon, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography* (Oxford, 1961)
Wilson, N.G., *Scholars of Byzantium* (2nd edn, London, 1996)
Woods, David, 'Thessalonica's patron: Saint Demetrius or Emeterius?', *Harvard Theological Review* 93 (2000), 221–34
—— 'The Cult of St Demetrius of Thessalonica', http://www.ucc.ie/milmart/Demetrius.html (Accessed on 2 August 2008)
Xyngopoulos, Andreas, 'Αἱ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Ἀχειροποιήτου Θεσσαλονίκης εἰδήσεις τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου Ἁρμενόπουλου', in *Τόμος Κωνσταντίνου Ἁρμενόπουλου. Ἐπί τῇ Ἑξακοσιετηρίδι τῆς Ἐξαβίβλου Αὐτοῦ (1345–1945)* (Thessalonica, 1952), pp. 1–26

—— Βυζαντινὸν κιβωτίδιον μετὰ παραστάσεων ἐκ τοῦ βίου τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου, *Archaeologike Ephimeris* (1936–7), 101–36

—— 'Καταφυγὴ-᾽Αχειροποίητος', *M* 4 (1955–60), 441–8

—— *Ὁ εἰκονογραφικὸς κύκλος τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Ἁγίου Δημητρίου* (Thessalonica, 1970)

Zachariadou, Elizabeth A., 'The conquest of Adrianople by the Turks', *Studi Veneziani* 12 (1970), 211–17, and reprinted in E.A. Zachariadou, *Romania and the Turks* (London, 1985), No. XII

Ziakas, Gregorios D., 'Πνευματικός βίος και πολιτισμός της Θεσσαλονίκης κατά την περίοδο της Οθωμανικής κυριαρχίας', *Χριστιανική Θεσσαλονίκη, Οθωμανική Περίοδος 1430–1912, Β΄* (Thessalonica, 1994), 90–165

Zeses, Theodoros N., *Γεννάδιος Β΄Σχολάριος. Βίος-Συγγράμματα-Διδασκαλία* (Thessalonica, 1980)

—— 'Το Θεολογικόν Έργον του Θεσσαλονικέως Αρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης Νείλου Καβάσιλα', *CTPE*, pp. 89–109

Glossary

acheiropoietos: 'not made by human hands'.
ambrosia: what the gods ate.
apostrophê: a grammatical phenomenon which takes place when the author talks to a character in a work directly in the second person. It is a Homeric technique.
appanage: a city-state with its hinterland being ruled as an autonomous unit with only loose connections to its capital.
Argives: a collective name to describe the Greek army in the *Iliad*. They are also called Acheans and Danaeans.
aristeia: excellence. A formal term, it was particularly used by the Alexandrian philologists to denote specific sections showing virtue in battle desplayed by Homeric heroes. *Aristeus* was a term used for Christian martyrs.
athlete of Christ: the metaphor of physical excellence is extended to the pursuit of the death for Christ.
athlophoros: prize-bearer; an epithet of the saint.
basileus: what the emperor was called in Byzantium.
basilica: initially a Roman building, later a Church of the same architectural features. The Church of St Demetrius in Thessalonica is a *basilica.*
'Christi Athleta': the Crusader wording for the 'athlete of Christ'.
Christo-centric: the methodological approach which places the person of Christ at the centre of all theology.
Daughter: in Greek, korê. It means maiden. It is often used today to describe Cycladic idols but in the context of Byzantine literature it normally refers to Persephone, daughter of the goddess of agriculture, Demeter.
Demetria: the name of the festival of St Demetrius.
despoina: meaning lady. A title of an Augusta and also, as Despoina, a name of the Virgin Mary.

despotes: meaning master. A title for a ruler and also, as Despotes, a name for Jesus. In Modern Greek, also another word for a Bishop.

diaulos: the middle ancient Greek measure for running athletes. The order is: stadion, diaulos, dolichos.

Digenes Akrites: the hero of the eponymous Greek folk-epic about life in the Borders of the empire.

diphrêlasia: an ancient Greek form of charioteering immortalised in the Odes of Pindar.

double-edged sword (φάσγανον ἄμφηκες): a descriptive term in Homer which takes a spiritual twist in the encomia.

fruit-bearing (καρποῦ φορά): borrowed from a passage on a treatise regarding plants by Theophrastus, the phrase is used in the encomia with a spiritual dimension.

Hades: the underworld of the Ancient Greeks. The term is also used by Christian writers.

hesychia: the monastic practice of contemplative prayer.

hieromenia: the ancient Greek word for the holy month. It is encountered in Thucydides (also see holy month).

himerodromos: 'day-runner'. A messanger who had to run all day to deliver an important message. Pheidippides, to whose honour we run marathons nowadays, was not an athlete but an himerodromos.

Hodegetria: an epithet of the Virgin Mary (meaning Leader). Glykophiloussa (the sweet-kissing One), Platytera Ouranon or simply Platytera (the One who is wider than the Heavens), Eleoussa (the all-Merciful), Perivleptos (the One who can be observed from everywhere) are other popular epithets that adorn her in literature and hymnography.

holy month: an ancient Greek term which denoted truce. In the context of the cult of St Demetrius it is the month of October.

Holy Week of St Demetrius: the festival of the saint modelled on the Holy Week.

iatros aristos: a perfect physician; refers to the powers of the saint to heal. Apart from the medical saints (Anargyroi) such as St Cosmas and Damian, St Panteleimon and St Tryphon, other saints have been referred to in this way. Cf. St Anastasia

Pharmakolytria (the one who makes poisonous bitterness disappear; also see pharmakon nepenthes).

Kataphyge: meaning refuge; refers to a specific location of the saint's martyrdom, probably the Church of the Acheiropoietos.

kratos: strength.

lance: symbolic of the Passion of the Lord and important in St Demetrius's legend (also see spear).

Lemnian: an epithet of Athena, who had a strong cult in Lemnos.

lyaeus: descriptive adjective of a follower of the rituals of Dionysus.

Marathon: the site of the Battle of Marathon from which the running event of the modern Olympic Games takes its name.

Megalomartys: the Great Martyr; an epithet of the saint.

myron: variously described as myrrh and nard.

nectar: what the gods drank.

pharmakon nepenthes: a medicine which takes away the sorrows. The term describes a drink in the Odyssey shared by Telemachus, Menelaus and Helen in the palace in Sparta, on the occasion of Telemachus's visit in search of news of his father, Odysseus. The term has been used in modern poetry by Baudelaire and Karyotakis.

philotimia: love of honour, ambition. Other meanings of the word include the undertaking of public service and indulgence in superfluous luxuries.

proeortia: the eve of a feast day.

proteleia: preliminary rites and sacrifices; these can take place before a wedding, in which case they are called προγάμεια.

spear: the piercing of the saint signifies that Demetrius is a type for Christ.

Synodikon: a Church book that describes the rituals.

therapon: a Homeric word for an affectionate companion who serves a hero.

usury: money-lending; it was frowned upon in the Middle Ages.

wrath of Achilles: the subject matter of the *Iliad*.

Index

In this index I have listed persons under the name by which they are referred to the most in the text. In that I have chosen clarity over consistency.

26 October, the feast of St Demetrius 15, 96, 130, 131
27 October, the feast of St Nestor, 30

Aaron, 69
Abydos, 14
Achaeans, 53
Acheiropoietos, Church of, 15, 31, 50, 51, 52, 70, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 129
Achilles, (the Homeric hero), 38, 40, 46, 52, 53
Achilles, (the eponymous character of *The Achilleid*), 38
Adrianople, 18, 21
Aegina, 46
Aeneas, 42
Aeschylus, 37, 46
Aesop, 65
Against Gregoras, 39
Against Meidias, 45
Agamemnon, 45, 46
Agesilaus, 39
Air (four elements), 59
Alcamenes, 58, 61
Alexander the Great, 30, 35, 43, 48, 79, 80, 93, 131, 148
Alexander, son of Priam (Paris), 24
Alexandrian philologists, 40
Alexios I Komnenos, 14
Alexios Apokaukos, 20
Ambrose of Milan, St, 87
ambrosia, 51
Amphytrion, 50
ancient Greek tragedy, 87
Andromache, 38
Andromachus of Crete, 41
Andronikos II Palaiologos, 17, 20, 29, 39
Andronikos III Palaiologos, 17
Andronikos IV Palaiologos, 18, 117
Andronikos, Despot of Thessalonica, 19, 77, 117, 118, 119, 120
Andronikos Kallistos, 130
Ankara, 21, 24, 33, 111
Anna of Savoy 17, 20, 22
Anonymous author of *vita*, 12
anthypatos, 56
Antigone, 42, 48, 49
Antioch, 28, 60, 121
Antirrhetica, 65
Apelles, 61
Aphrodite, 59, 61
Aphrodite in the Gardens, 61
Aphrodite of Cnidus, 61
Apokaukoi, 20
Apollo, 59
Apology of Socrates, The, 51
apostrophê, 76
appanage, 17, 18
Appian, 40, 46
Arabic lands, the, 84
Arabs, 14, 21
Ares, 57
Argives, 46
Aristoclides, 46
aristocracy, 19, 22
Aristotle, 37, 39, 45, 47, 53
Arrian, 48
Artemis, 59

Asclepiades, son of Hipparchus, 48
Athanasius the Great, 71
Athena, 61
Athens, 7, 45, 49, 51, 61
athlete, 65, 71, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 85
athlete of Christ, 65, 71, 73, 75
athlophoros, 11
Augustine, St, 34
autonomy, 10, 19, 103, 124
Avars, 14

Balkan Wars, 131
Bardas Phokas, 14
Barlaam, 26
Basil II, 14
Basil, St, 65, 71
Basil Digenes Akrites, 10, 13, 14
basileus, 24, 96
basilica, 12, 15, 95, 115, 129
Bayezid, 23, 24, 33
Bertrandon de la Broquière, 129
betrothal, 94
Bohemond, 14, 75
Bringer of Light, 59
Bulgars, 16, 21
Bürak, son of Evren, 22

Calchas, 45
Calliope, 58
Canon, 102
Carthaginians, 41
Cassandra, 58
Castor, 50
Caucasus, 84
Chalcedon, 33
Charmides, 51
'Christi Athleta', 75
Christian life, the, 41, 66, 72, 73, 81, 85, 107, 125
Christo-centric, 87
civil war, 20, 114
Civil Wars, *The*, 46
class (tensions and divisions), 21, 22
classical Athens, 87
Clement of Alexandria, 71
Clio, 58
coins, 21, 24, 129
Colossus of Rhodes, 50
Commentary on the Divine Liturgy, 32
Constantine Palaiologos (1261–1306), 17
Constantine Ivankos, 26
Constantinople
  Monastery of St Demetrius, 14, 20
  Monastery of St John Stoudios, 20
  Monastery of St Saviour in Chora, 29
Constantius Chlorus, 11
Corfu, 130
Council of Florence, 34
Crassus, 44, 45
Creon, 42, 49
Cronos, 57
Cumans, 14
cyclic theme, 98
Cyprus, 121
Cyriac of Ancona, 129
Cyril of Alexandria, 71
Cyropaideia, 42
Cyrus, 42

Daughter (i.e. Persephone), 59
David, Psalmist, the, 13, 30, 67, 148
De Consolatione ad Polybium, 50
deer, 108
deities of the Sea, 59
deity, 16, 34
Demades, 48
Demeter, 16, 59
Demetria, 16
Demetrius Chrysoloras, 33, 34, 36, 37, 54, 63, 65, 71, 80, 95, 114, 115
Demetrius Palaiologos, Despot of Thessalonica, 20
Demetrius Sgouropoulos, 130
demi-gods, 58, 59
Demosthenes, 34, 45, 46
Depiction of Spring in a Dyed, Woven Hanging, 63

Description of Greece, 49
despoina, 17
despotes, 18, 19
diaulos, 49
Digenes Akrites, see Basil Digenes Akrites
Diocletian, 11
Diodorus of Sicily, 49
Diogenes of Sinope, cynic philosopher, 43, 44, 93
Diomedes, son of Tydeus, 40, 42, 48, 70
diphrêlasia, 49
distorting mirror (alas!), 36
Dorians, 46
double-edged sword, 48
Doukas, 23, 24, 122, 124, 125

Earth, 59
Egypt, 68, 84, 121
Eirene (Yolanda of Montferrat), 17
Electra, 50
Enquiry into Plants, 47
Ephraem the Syrian, 71
Epidaurus, 46
Epistle to the Romans, 53
Epitome Kanonon, 31
Essays in Portraiture, 60
Eteocles, 49
Ethics, 52
Euclid, 34
Euripides, 37, 46, 53
Europe, 21
Eustathios Voilas, 65
Euthydemus, 41, 70
exemptions, 19

fasting, 31, 90
Fire, 59
First Crusade, 28
four seasons, 96, 104
Francesco II Gattilusio, 19
fruit-bearing, 47

Gabriel of Thessalonica, 33, 35, 66, 71, 111
Galen, 41
Galerius, 11, 12
Gallipoli, 21
Gattilusi of Lesvos, 19
George, St, 11, 13
Gesta Francorum, 75
Gibraltar, 84
government, 9, 17, 19, 22
Granada, fall of, 129
Grand Logothete, 29
Gregorios of Thessalonica, Metropolitan, 130
Gregory of Nazianzus, 63, 71
Gregory of Neocaesarea, 71
Gregory of Nyssa, 71

Hades, 48
Hadji Khalfa, 130
Hadrian, 60
Hannibal, 44
harmonic laws, 96
Hector, 38
Hephaestus, 59, 61
Hera, 59, 61
Hercules, 12, 50
Herculius, 11, 12
heresy, 31, 55
Hermes, 59
Hermogenes of Tarsus, 37
Herodotus, 37, 40, 48, 49
Hesiod, 36, 41
hesychasm, 21, 26, 131
hesychia, 26
Hexabiblos or *Procheiron Nomôn*, 31
Hexameron, 65
hieromenia, 46
himerodromos, 49
History by Gregoras, 46, 52
Hodegetria, 98
Holy Week, 87, 90
holy month of Nemea, the, 46
holy month, the, 46, 91, 92
Homer, 34, 36, 37, 38, 48, 52, 53, 65, 76

iatros aristos, 55
Iliad, 37, 38, 40, 42, 48, 76
Imagines, 60, 62
Imitator of Christ, 28
independence, 16, 18, 19, 22
inner, 26, 41, 79, 106
  inner learning, 26
Iolaus, 50
Iphigenia, 45, 46
  Iphigenia in Aulis, 45, 46
Isaiah, Prophet, 65, 67
Isidore Glavas, 32, 33, 35, 65, 107, 108
Isidore I Boucheiras, 76
Ismene, 49
Isocrates, 37, 48
Isthmian Games, 72
Isthmian Ode, 50
Italy, 23, 117, 130

Janus Laskaris, 130
Jeremiah, Prophet, 70, 112
Jerusalem, 68, 86, 112, 113, 121
Job, 44
John Chortasmenos, 34
John Chrysostom, 71, 72, 73
John Damascene, 71
John Klimakos, 26, 71, 73
John Laskaris, 14
John Moschos, 130
John Pediasimos Pothos, 38
John V Palaiologos, 17, 18
John VII Palaiologos, 19, 21, 23, 34, 114, 116, 117
John VIII Palaiologos, 114, 119, 120
Joseph, in Egypt, 68
Justinian II, 14

Kalekas, 16, 88
Kalojan, 14
Kastoria, Church of St Athanasios, 20
Kataphyge, 52, 98, 99
Kavasilas, 12, 17, 23, 31, 32, 36, 53
Kokkinos, 17, 31, 34, 35, 39, 71, 76, 78, 81, 90
kratos, 54
Kydones, Demetrius, 65

Ladder of Divine Ascent, *The*, 73
lance, 108, 148
Larissa, 14
Latin rule, 16, 121
Laws, 40, 46
Lemnian (epithet of Athena), 58
Lemnos, 24, 61
Lent, 85, 99
Leon Allatius of Chios, 31
Leontaris, Demetrius Laskaris, 19, 117
Lesvos, 19
Libanius, 63
Libya, 84
Life in Christ, *The*, 32
liturgy, 63, 121
London, 9, 130, 131
Loupos, companion saint of Demetrius, 13, 42, 53
love of Christ, 32, 78, 108
Lucian, 34, 37, 60, 61, 62, 65
Lucius Verus, 60
Luke Spandounes, 130
Lyaeus (gladiator), 13, 42, 70, 76, 78, 80
  lyaeus (descriptive adjective), 53
Lycinus, 60

Macedonia, 17, 18, 43, 44
Makarios Choumnos, 32, 33, 35, 71, 75, 105
Manastras, 14
Manuel Chrysoloras, 33, 61
Manuel Laskaris, 130
Manuel Moschopoulos, 38
Manuel Philes, poet, 20
Marathon, 49
Marcus Aurelius, 11, 37, 60
Matthew Laskaris, 130
Mauias, 50
Maximian (in relation to the martyrdom of Demetrius), 11, 12, 13, 29, 34, 42, 48, 49, 54, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 80, 94
Maximos and Kallistos Xanthopoulos, 94

medieval king (Despot Andronikos as), 19
Megalomartys, 11
Megas Dux, 20
Mehmed I, 28, 35
Menelaus, 45, 76
Mercurius, 28
mesazon, 34
Methodios of Thessalonica, Metropolitan, 130
Metochites, Theodore, 29, 30, 35, 39, 41, 42, 43, 50, 70, 76, 81, 93, 105
Michael (the Archangel), 28
Michael VIII Palaiologos, 14, 17
Miracula, 12
Miriam, 68
Mistra, 9, 20
Church of the Mitropolis, 20
month of Carneus, the, 46
Moon, 59
Moralia, 46
Moses, 68, 126, 127
Mount Athos, 23, 27, 30, 116
mourning, 87
Murad I, 21
Murad II, 18, 21, 22, 127, 129
'my living Christ', 59
myrrh, 11, 15, 16, 20, 34, 48, 67, 70, 89, 90, 93, 95, 107, 108, 109, 114, 129

Nea Moni (i.e. New Monastery), 32, 33, 105
nectar, 51
Nemean Games, 46
Nemean Odes, 46
Neophytos the Recluse, 74
nephew of Manuel II, see John VII Palaiologos
Nero, 41, 50
Nestor, companion saint of Demetrius, 13, 15, 42, 53, 70, 76, 78
Nicholas Isidoros, 130
Nicomachean Ethics, 45
Niketas Choniates, 61
Nomophylax, 30
Normans, 21

Octavian, 46
October (the saint's month), 15, 35, 46, 91, 93, 97, 99, 131
Odysseus, 40, 48
Odyssey, 40, 52
Olympian, 50, 51, 53
Olympus, 50, 51, 52
On the Causes of Plants, 47
On the Crown, 45
on the nature of time, 29
Orestes, 44, 50
Orpheus, 53
outer (learning), 26

palace, 12, 31
Palaiologan dynasty, 17
Palaiologan Renaissance, 29
Panagia Acheiropoietos, also see Acheiropoietos Church of, 15
Pandarus, 42
Panhellenic Games, 72
Panthea, 60, 61
Paris (son of Priam); also see Alexander, 40
Paris (city), 63, 130
Passion, the, 28, 90
Patroclus, 40, 52, 53, 76
patron saint, 14, 20, 90, 131
Pausanias, 49
Peloponnese, 20, 24
Peripatetic school, 47
periphery, 19
Persephone, 59
Peter Deljan, 14
pharmakon nepenthes, 109
Pheidippides, 49
Phidias, 61
Philip II, King of Macedonia, 43, 44
philotimia, 44
Phocion, 48
Photios, 12
Pindar, 36, 46, 50
Plataeans, 46

Plato, 37, 40, 41, 46, 48, 49, 51, 53, 56, 65, 70
Plato, uncle (of Theodore of Stoudios), 74
pledge, 94
Plethon, George Gemistos, 130
Plutarch, 35, 44, 46, 48, 52, 53
Pluto, 59
Polygnotus, 58
Polymnia, 58
Polyneikes, 49
Polystratus, 60, 62
Polyxena, 38
Poseidon, 59, 72
Praxiteles, 61
proeortia, 97
Protagoras, 49, 51
protector, 14, 15, 20, 33, 54, 72, 112, 115
Prytaneion, 51
psalmody, 110, 101
Psalms, 65, 69
Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, 71
Ptolemy, 34
Pylades, 44
Pythian Ode, 50

Rea, 58
regency, 19
relics, 16, 94
Romylos, St, 76

sailors, 72
Salonica, City of Ghosts, 131
Scholarios, George (Patriarch Gennadios II), 34, 35, 71, 76, 107, 108
Scipio, 40, 44
Scipio Aemilianus Africanus, 44
Scipio Africanus, 44
Scyths, 111
sea, 18, 19, 55, 59, 90, 106, 107, 109, 115
sea-god Palaemon, 72
seasons of nature, the, 47
Semiramis, Queen of Babylon, 44
Seneca the Younger, 50
separatism, 19
Serres, 19, 35
Shiny One, 59
Sicilian Normans, 14, 16
Sinope, 43
Sirens, 52
Slavs, 11, 14, 21
Smyrna, 60
Socrates, 34, 51, 53
Sophocles, 37, 40, 42, 49, 50
Sosandra (epithet of Aphrodite), 61
Spartans, 46
spear, 76
spring and summer, 47
stephanitis, 99
Stephen, St, 99
Suleyman, son of Bayezid I, 24
Sun, 59
Symeon Metaphrastes, 12
Synodikon, 18, 166
syntax, 31
Syropoulos, Sylvester, 114

tax, 19, 130
Telesicrates of Cyrene, 50
ten Attic Orators, the, 37
theatre stage, 87
Thebans, 46
Theodore I Palaiologos, despot of the Morea, 16
Theodore II Palaiologos, son of Manuel II, 16
Theodore Gazes, 130
Theodore of Stoudios, 74
Theodore Stratelates, St, 13
Theodore Tyron, St, 13
Theophanes Confessor, 50
Theophrastus, 47
therapon, 52
Thessaly, 19
Thessalonica, Church of Christ (of the Transfiguration of the Saviour), 16
Thrace, 17
Thrasymedes, 48
Thucydides, 37, 46

Timarion, 16, 85
Tiresias, 42
tomb, 11, 15, 16, 20, 34, 93, 114, 117
Transfiguration, 26
Triads in Defence of the Holy Hesychasts, 30
Trnovo, 16
Troy, 46

Union of the Churches, 34
usury, 22, 23, 32

vassal status, 18
Virgin in prayer, 98
Virgin Mary, 15, 52, 70, 98, 99, 126

Works and Days, 41
wrath of Achilles, the, 48

Xenophon, 39, 42, 56
Xerxes, 44
Xiphilinos, 65

Yiannitsa, 131

Zealot, 18, 20, 22
Zeus, 95, 96
Zeuxis, 61

Byzantine and Neohellenic Studies

Edited by

Andrew Louth, Professor of Patristic and Byzantine Studies,
University of Durham.

David Ricks, Professor of Modern Greek and Comparative Literature,
King's College London.

This series encompasses the religion, culture, history, and literary production of the Greek-speaking world and its neighbours from the fourth century AD to the present. It aims to provide a forum for original scholarly work in any of these fields, covering cultures as diverse as Late Antiquity, the Byzantine empire, the Venetian empire, the Christian communities under Ottoman rule, and the modern nation states of Greece and Cyprus. Submissions in English are welcomed in the form of monographs, annotated editions, or collections of papers.

Volume 1 Anthony Hirst, *God and the Poetic Ego: The Appropriation of Biblical and Liturgical Language in the Poetry of Palamas, Sikelianos and Elytis.*
425 pages. 2004. ISBN 3-03910-327-X

Volume 2 Hieromonk Patapios and Archbishop Chrysostomos, *Manna from Athos: The Issue of Frequent Communion on the Holy Mountain in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries.*
187 pages. 2006. ISBN 3-03910-722-4

Volume 3 Liana Giannakopoulou, *The Power of Pygmalion: Ancient Greek Sculpture in Modern Greek Poetry, 1860-1960.* 340 pages. 2007. ISBN 978-3-03910-752-0

Volume 4 Irene Loulakaki-Moore, *Seferis and Elytis as Translators.* 392 pages. 2010. ISBN 978-3-03911-918-9

Volume 5 Forthcoming.

Volume 6 Eugenia Russell, *St Demetrius of Thessalonica: Cult and Devotion in the Middle Ages.* 213 pages. 2010. ISBN 978-3-0343-0181-7